EXHIBIT O

MAR Hearing Transcript Vol. I (pp 1-151)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE

COUNTY OF RICHMOND

SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION

FILE NO. 96 CRS 001576

versus

TRANSCRIPT

VOLUME I OF III

DERRICK MCRAE

Defendant

Transcript of proceedings in the General Court of Justice, Superior Court Division, Richmond County, North Carolina, at the December 1, 2014 session, before the Honorable David Lee, presiding.

> Patrice B. Lee, CVR-CM Official Court Reporter Superior Court

APPEARANCES

ON BEHALF OF THE STATE

Ryan Haigh, Special Deputy Attorney General
114 W. Edenton Street

Raleigh, NC 27602

Steven M. Arbogast, Special Deputy Attorney General

114 W. Edenton Street

Raleigh, NC 27602

ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT

Jamie T. Lau, Esquire

Wrongful Convictions Clinic

210 Science Drive

Durham, NC 27708

James E. Coleman, Esquire

210 Science Drive

Durham, NC 27708

Theresa A. Newman, Esquire

210 Science Drive

Durham, NC 277008

INDEX

WITNESS	ES FOR THE DEFENSE	PAGE
MR. GEO	RGE E. CRUMP, III	
	Direct Examination	22
	Cross Examination	61
MR. EDW	ARD TENDER	
	Direct Examination	115
	Cross Examination	125
MR. ROB	ERT VOORHEES	
	Direct Examination	126
EXHIBIT	S FOR THE DEFENSE	
1	Discovery Form	61
2	Discovery Form	61
3 - 11	Witness Statements	61
12	Notice to Mr. McRae	61
13	Attorney Timesheet	61
14	Motion for Witness	61
15	Criminal Disposition	61
16	Criminal Record	61
17	Transcript of Second Trial	114
18	Testimony of Mr. Sturdevant	114
19	Statement by Mr. Tender	126

(The case of the State of North Carolina versus Derrick McRae, Richmond County, File No. 96 CRS 001576, was called for hearing on December 1, 2014. The defendant and all counsel are present.)

THE COURT: Good morning. I apologize for being a little bit tardy. This is swearing in day for all politicians that were elected to start are sworn in the first Monday in December, so I was in another county this morning. First, Counsel, if you will state your appearances and we will move forward as expeditiously as we can.

1.3

2.2

MR. HAIGH: Ryan Haigh, for the State.

MR. ARBOGAST: Steven Arbogast for North Carolina,
Your Honor.

MR. LAU: Jamie Lau for Mr. Mcrae and James Coleman for Mr. Mcrae. Theresa Newman is also making an appearance. She is back with Mr. Mcrae now. We would ask the Court respectfully to begin this hearing, Mr. Mcrae's family brought clothes for him to wear today, and we would ask that he be allowed to change into those clothes prior to coming out today, with your permission.

THE COURT: I have no problem with that. As you well know, this is a matter before me and I don't necessarily notice clothes, but if you want to do that, that is fine.

MR. LAU: That would be fantastic.

THE COURT: Some judges don't appreciate people appearing in court with pants around their ankles or matters of that nature. I don't look, I guess you should do a better job. If he's more comfortable in some street clothes, I certainly don't have any problem with that.

MR. LAU: Thank you, Your honor.

1.3

2.1

2.2

set up. Gentleman, how do you want to proceed? Evidentiary hearings and MARs are few and far between, but it's ordinarily my practice, if you so desire, to allow both defense counsel and the State to make opening statements if you wish to do so, in terms of the forecast or prediction of what you believe the real issues boil down to in the case. I read this file over a period of time, actually, reread the motion last night, so I'll try to call on my memory to pull in as much of this as we can, but I do want to give you an opportunity to make opening statements if you wish to do that and we can get underway. Anything else we need to address?

MR. LAU: We actually moved at the beginning of this hearing — based on some of the State's subpoenas, it appears that they are prepared to call individuals who gave statements to the Rockingham Police Department that didn't testify at trial. We would move now to exclude any testimony from any witnesses, fact witnesses, who did not appear at trial. State versus Peterson makes clear that the

limitation at such an MAR hearing, and I have that case for you. It's the evidence directly relevant to a claim that you can't collaterally try to establish that the outcome would have been the same through evidence of guilt that wasn't presented at trial. So, we would move at the outset on the basis — I know some of the individuals who gave those statements and did not end up testifying are here in court today on subpoenas from the State, so we would move to exclude any testimony from those individuals at the outset.

1.3

2.1

2.2

THE COURT: My recollection is some of what the issue here had to do with some statements or information in the State's file that was not turned over, and that some, perhaps not all those people, testified at the trial on behalf of the defendant.

MR. LAU: Only two of those individuals testified for the State.

THE COURT: You have reference now of people -- other than those two?

MR. LAU: People other than those two.

THE COURT: What's the State's position?

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'll stipulate to that. There is nobody in the courtroom here today that we subpoenaed that gave a statement that did not testify.

THE COURT: Sounds like it may be moot then.

MR. LAU: We'll be in agreement then, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We will wait just a few minutes for the defendant then.

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, there is one other thing.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. HAIGH: If we could sequester the witnesses, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What says the defendant to that request?

MR. LAU: We would object simply for the burden it is on the witnesses to be waiting, not knowing when they're going to be called outside the courtroom. We don't think that there is anything that they would hear from prior witnesses' testimony that would change the course of the nature of their testimony.

THE COURT: What makes you think that?

MR. LAU: Because each individual is going to be testifying to separate events within their own personal knowledge that doesn't build on the prior testimony of the other witnesses. With that said, we would imagine that there is no way in which the other witnesses could corrupt those testifying afterwards. It's a matter of important public significance we have individuals as well who are here to testify who is a state psychologist from Dorothea Dix, a psychiatrist, and her testimony is very unlikely — as a professional who often testifies on behalf of the prosecution, I can't see any impact on her testimony. Our

position would be that it's unnecessary; but, of course, we would leave it to the Court.

THE COURT: With all due respect to any witnesses who may be out there, I'm not so concerned about the inconvenience of them not being in the courtroom, I guess I'm always erring on -- attempting to err on the side of assuring that there is not a problem in that regard if something does come up through the questioning of a witness here that might be the same general area of inquiry that would be asked of another witness who is here. I think the better course would be to sequester at least fact witnesses. What says the State to the -- is it Dr. Wolf or who is that?

MR. LAU: It is Dr. Wolf.

1.3

2.1

2.2

THE COURT: Any problems with Dr. Wolf remaining here?

MR. HAIGH: No, Your Honor, that's fine.

THE COURT: I'm going to allow Dr. Wolf to remain, but I would sequester the other potential fact witnesses. In order to do that and make it stick better or have some record of it, I need to know who that is and I need to speak with them and be sure they understand what the rules are with respect to sequestration. Do you have a list of those who you are asking to be sequestered?

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, we haven't been provided a list of Mr. McRae's witnesses.

MR. LAU: The two witnesses that would impact today would be Mr. Edward Tender as well as Robert Voorhees. Those are the two individuals who will be testifying of the folks who are here today. They will testify should time allow. Michael Parker will also be here later today, the former elected DA of the prosecution district, so he would also be an individual that would be subject to that court order.

1.3

2.2

THE COURT: So Mr. Voorhees and Mr. Tender are in the courtroom right now?

MR. LAU: Yes. Mr. Tender is here. Mr. Voorhees has not arrived yet.

THE COURT: Mr. Tender, I am going to ask that you -when we actually get into the process of hearing testimony,
unless you are the first witness called, I'm going to ask
that you step out of the courtroom.

If we can make some accommodation for him, Sheriff, somewhere else on this floor.

We want you to be comfortable, but just out of the abundance of caution, I'm going to ask that you not be in here while these other fact witnesses are testifying. After you've testified, you're welcome to stay as long as you'd like. Once you've testified, there is no bar to your being present for further testimony. Do you understand that? Anything else?

MR. HAIGH: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.

MR. LAU: Nothing further.

THE COURT: We will just wait for the defendant to come out.

THE COURT: The Sheriff makes a good point ladies and gentlemen, this is a specially commissioned session of court for the purposes of hearing a motion for appropriate relief filed on behalf of Derrick McRae, so you may have been subpoenaed or you may be a defendant in the regular ongoing session of criminal Superior Court which is in the next courtroom, in the big courtroom, it' Courtroom E I believe it is. Make sure you're in the right courtroom. If you have some involvement with the McRae matter, you are in the right place. If you have other matters in Richmond County of a criminal nature this morning, then you're probably not in the right place. You need to be in the next courtroom, so just be aware of that.

Thank you, Sheriff.

2.1

2.2

MR. LAU: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may,
Mr. Thurmond Nelson has arrived in the courtroom. He is also
a witness that has been subpoenaed. My understanding is both
by the defense and the State, so accommodations would also
have to be made for Mr. Nelson as well. Of course, any other
witnesses that the State may have, we would ask likewise that
they be.

THE COURT: All right. Where is Mr. Nelson?

MR. LAU: He's in the white shirt in the back row,

Your Honor.

1.3

2.1

2.2

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Wilson, you may have come in late, excuse me, Mr. Nelson, you may have come in late, but I'm going to allow the motion that's been made to sequester the witnesses, so that when we start taking evidence, unless you're called as the first witness, I'm going to ask that you, along with Mr. Tender, be outside of the courtroom and remain outside of the courtroom until you are called to testify. Do you understand that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, the only other witness that I see in the courtroom is Mr. Crump. He's been subpoenaed by the State.

THE COURT: All right. And what's your position?

MR. LAU: We anticipate calling Mr. Crump at the outset of the evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LAU: So there will be no need to sequester him.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Crump. You may stay with us then. You may remain after you testify. Give me just a minute to get this computer set up. All right. Let the record reflect that the defendant, Mr. McRae, is present in the court with us this morning.

Good morning, Mr. McRae. I'm doing well. I hope you are.

1 Also, Ms. Newman has joined us. Good morning, Ms. 2 Newman. 3 MS. NEWMAN: Good morning. 4 THE COURT: As I explained to counsel before you 5 folks came in, it's my practice to allow you, if you wish to 6 do so, to make a brief opening statement before we actually 7 get into the evidentiary hearing. 8 So, Mr. Lau or any of your colleagues, if you wish to 9 make an opening statement on behalf of the defendant, I'll be 10 glad to hear one. 11 MR. LAU: Yes, Your Honor, but apparently we have 12 another witness who has shown up. 1.3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 14 MR. LAU: I'm afraid this may occur throughout the 15 day, but Mr. Voorhees has arrived, so we would ask that he be 16 accommodated by the Sheriff. 17 THE COURT: Where is Mr. Voorhees? 18 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Voorhees, a motion was made earlier 20 that witnesses be sequestered in this matter; that is, they 2.1 be outside of the courtroom during the testimony of other 2.2 fact witnesses, and you are on that list, so unless, and 23 until you are called to testify -- once the actual testimony 24 commences, I'm going to need to ask that you remain outside

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

of the courtroom until you are actually called as a witness.

25

Once you have been called and testified, you may remain or you may, with the consent of counsel, be released from your subpoena, but until then, we need to ask that you remain outside once the testimony starts. You're welcome to stay until, I believe, the defendant intends to call Mr. Crump. So, when he's called for, I will need to ask you, as well as these other witnesses whom I've already spoken to, just remain outside of the courtroom until you are called.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

1.3

2.1

2.2

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. LAU: Your Honor, this case involves several claims of a constitutional nature and 15A 1420(c)(5)of the General Statutes describes the burden that must be established at this proceeding with respect to those claims, and we must show by a preponderance of the evidence that those constitutional violations have occurred. After we've made that showing, the burden then shifts onto the State to show, by clear and convincing evidence, that it was a harmless error. That Mr. McRae would have been convicted despite the constitutional violations which occurred. I submit to this Court that the evidence is going to clearly show that those constitutional violations occurred.

Mr. Crump will get up and he will testify to statements that he did not receive from the prosecutors in this case. Statements that from the state's very own filings were

inconclusive and conflicting. The States says they're conflicting. They are inconsistent and conflicting with respect to Mr. Nelson. We submit to you they are inconsistent and conflicting with respect to Mr. McRae as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The case that guides these claims is Kyles v Whitley which was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1995. In that case, very similarly, witnesses who didn't testify gave inconsistent statements to the police. The Court found that those were material, and part of the reason they found that they were material was it showed a remarkably uncritical attitude by law enforcement with respect to their investigation, that had the jury known, the jury was unlikely -- or there was a reasonable probability that the outcome would have been different at trial. Importantly, in Kyles versus Whitley, similar to Mr. McRae's case, the Courts reference back to the first trial, the trial in which the jury was hung. There was a mistrial declared. They said that in light of the inconsistent statements from witnesses, like in this case who never testified, in light of those inconsistent statements, they showed that the Government's case was much weaker than that case heard by the first jury that was hung and a mistrial was declared.

Thus, they said they had to be material. They had to be prejudicial to the defendant to not have those statements.

Here, you will see, like in Kyles, a remarkably uncritical

attitude by law enforcement investigating this case. You will see numerous statements that were taken together, one perhaps could be true, but it's not one statement was truth, all of the remaining statements were false. Yet, there was no attempt to establish which, if any, of these statements were actually true. Mr. Crump never had the materials to challenge the investigation in this case. Kyles is instructed in that matter as well. Kyles says you don't have to call those witnesses themselves to give testimony, you can challenge law enforcement with those statements and you can challenge their investigation. In Kyles, the evidence — there was in these statements, inculpatory evidence like in the statements we have here. Yet Kyles says that's irrelevant because of what it shows about the police investigation, and here you are going to hear a lot about the police investigation in this case.

2.2

Second, you will hear Mr. Edward Tender take the stand, and he's going to say, regrettably, during a period of time he was an alcoholic — a period of time when his life was spiraling out of control — because of his alcoholism, he did what, unfortunately, criminal defendants do at times, he made a statement which was false implicating Derrick McRae in this case, and as a result of that statement he benefited by serving no time in jail when charged with numerous felonies.

Mr. Tender — you'll also hear that two charges, despite a comprehensive plea agreement that resolved all those felony

charges -- two charges were held open for a period of two years, and those charges were not resolved until two weeks after Mr. Tender gave testimony favorable to the State.

2.2

The burden on us, with respect to a recantation, is to demonstrate to this Court that the recanting witnesses' testimony today is likely to be true — more likely to be true than the testimony that was given at trial. In addition to Mr. Tender, you're going to hear the State's very own psychiatrist describe the medical records in this case, describe the pretrial holding of Mr. McRae where he was observed on a 24-hour basis for months prior to his trial as the defendants tried to render Mr. McRae competent by getting him on the right regimen of medications. During the course of those observations — contrary to what Mr. Tender's testimony was at trial, that Mr. McRae was this black militant adhering to Stokely Carmichael and Malcolm X intent on killing white people — he made no references to race at any time.

Now, these are not interviews from law enforcement, this is observations from the staff at the State's hospital, and he doesn't even know what time that they are paying attention to him, yet, zero references at all, zero indication that there was any racial prejudice from Mr. McRae. In addition to that, the medical records — when he's well medicated, appropriately medicated and at times when he's experiencing psychosis — indicate that he was withdrawn, a

loner, not someone to talk to others. Unlike the testimony 1 2 from Mr. Tender, that Mr. McRae approached him, talked 3 regularly to individuals while incarcerated and told him about 4 the crime. 5 In addition, during that period of time, he 6 consistently maintained to anyone, when asked, his innocence in 7 the case, clearly demonstrating that Mr. Tender's testimony 8 would have been completely out of character for Mr. McRae and 9 there is nothing to corroborate and support his testimony. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 11 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, the State will reserve its 12 opening statement to just prior to us presenting evidence. 1.3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Evidence then on 14 behalf of the defendant. 15 MR. LAU: The defense calls Mr. George Crump, Your 16 honor. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Crump, if you will come up please, 18 sir. 19 The witness, Mr. Crump, was sworn and testified 20 as follows to the examination of counsel. 2.1 THE COURT: Are there any others in the courtroom who 2.2 were subpoenaed in this case other than Dr. Wolf? 23 that there are none, I believe that all the other witnesses 24 25 THE BAILIFF: We have one, Judge.

1 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Your name? 2 THE WITNESS: Jeremy Sturdevant. 3 THE COURT: Jeremy Sturdevant? Is he subpoenaed? 4 MR. HAIGH: I believe that the State may have 5 subpoenaed Mr. Sturdevant, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sturdevant, I've 7 explained to these others that, because you're a potential 8 fact witness, we are asking that all of those witnesses, 9 other than the witness who is testifying, remain outside of 10 the courtroom until you are called. You will need to remain 11 with us, but if you will just remain outside, there are 12 several others out there that are under the same order. 1.3 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, if I may, it sounds like 14 Dr. Wolf will actually be presenting fact testimony as 15 opposed to expert testimony based upon the opening statement, 16 and so, I'd ask that she be removed from the courtroom. 17 THE COURT: All right. What do you say to that 18 Mr. Lau? 19 I don't think we ever indicated that MR. LAU: Yes. 20 she would be doing anything other than that. As a clinical 2.1 psychiatrist, I don't believe that she would be corrupted by 2.2 any of the prior testimony or that her viewpoints would 23 change with respect to any of the prior testimony that she 24 hears.

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

MR. HAIGH:

25

Your Honor --

I'm sorry. I thought I understood you to 1 THE COURT: 2 say that you did not have an objection to Dr. Wolf. 3 MR. HAIGH: And that was based upon my understanding 4 that, you know, she was going to provide expert testimony 5 which would allow her to hear the testimony of other people, 6 Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask that Dr. Wolf be 8 sequestered as well. 9 Dr. Wolf, I'll ask that you try to find a 10 convenient place for you to remain. 11 DR. WOLF: I actually do think that my testimony is 12 still related to my giving expert testimony. 1.3 MR. LAU: There would be some opinion that she would 14 give based on -- or her position as a State Psychiatrist, an 15 expert in psychiatry. 16 THE COURT: Sure. 17 MR. LAU: So it would go to the fact witness as well 18 as expert witness. 19 THE COURT: I guess my point is, would her testimony, 20 as an expert, be the same whether she's in the courtroom or 2.1 not? Wouldn't it be the same? Wouldn't you expect it to be 2.2 the same? 23 MR. LAU: Can I take a minute to confirm with Ms. 24 Wolf? 25 THE COURT: Sure.

Thank you very much, Your Honor. having talked with Dr. Wolf, there are two things that we would like to inform this Court of. She believes strongly that having reviewed Mr. Tender's prior testimony with respect to Mr. McRae, what he purportedly told Mr. Tender, that it would be important to her professional opinion to hear Mr. Tender's testimony. Moreover, she also will talk about Mr. McRae's behavior over that two-year period, and the fact that he consistently maintained his innocence during that period, and she thinks it is extremely relevant to her testimony to hear the nature of the environmental stressors that he was under as a result of this investigation, the testimony regarding that investigation when she's giving that testimony, and it would be our position that she should be here for that testimony given that that's going to impact the professional opinion she may have with respect to how those stressors impacted Mr. McRae and how they relate to his persistent declarations of innocence while at the State's psychiatric hospital.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: What says the state?

MR. HAIGH: A couple of things, Your Honor. First and foremost, what is proposed by Mr. McRae'ss counsel is that a witness will be commenting on the veracity of the testimony of another witness which is not permitted.

Moreover, the doctor was not -- we were not notified of the

expert witness testifying in this case and given the lack of notice, I believe that she will be precluded from testifying in any expert context anyway.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

MR. LAU: Your Honor, with regard to notice, obviously, Ms. Wolf has been active in this case that the State is well aware of. Additionally, the State, at the respective competency hearing, stipulated and had in its possession the entire records that Ms. Wolf will comment on from Mr. McRae's pretrial detention. So, any suggestion that they have been unable to prepare for Ms. Wolf testifying today would be a result of their own lack of diligence, not a result of their not having any formal notice. There is nothing in post conviction that says we have to give the State notice that Ms. Wolf is going to testify and again, I emphasize that the State had the very records that Ms. Wolf is going to talk about and their lack of preparation is not our problem. It should be the State's onus to go through the case, to learn the case, to learn the materials in the case, and at the retrospective competency hearing, they were provided the very materials that Ms. Wolf has provided.

THE COURT: I'm a little concerned that you suggest the State lacks preparedness or that they ought to do things in a certain manner, Mr. Lau. I think the State has brought a latitude of discretion, as do most any attorneys who appear in court do, what they think is in the best interest, in this

case, of the State, but I am -- did you have anything further that you wanted to add?

MR. HAIGH: Just briefly, Your Honor. The issue of competency, to which the doctor testified to, has already been resolved. It was resolved years ago. The matter to which she was involved isn't a matter before the Court. If you look at the claims in the MAR, and you stated that you have, there is nothing in there that resurrects any of those claims associated with the state of mind of the defendant or his competency, so based upon that, I don't even see how that would be relevant, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In my discretion, I'm going to allow her to remain here to the extent that she hears other fact witnesses and may herself testify to facts in the case. I think I'm tasked with determining the veracity and credibility of testimony, and I will view that in light of the knowledge that she is in the courtroom when others are testifying. So, I am going to allow her to remain. Anything further?

MR. HAIGH: Nothing from the State Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Crump, having been duly sworn, he is your witness, Mr. Lau.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. LAU:

1.3

2.2

Q Good morning, Mr. Crump. First for the record, can

you state your full name for the court? 1 2 George E. Crump, III. And Mr. Crump, how are you currently employed? 3 4 I'm a general practitioner and that's my sole 5 occupation, and it's my full-time occupation. I practice here 6 at Rockingham. 7 And how long have you been practicing here at 8 Rockingham? 9 I have practiced since August 31st 1977. I'm on my 10 38th year. 11 And during the course of your practice, was there a 12 time that you became known to Mr. McRae? That you met 13 Mr. McRae? That you would have represented Mr. McRae? 14 I met Mr. McRae on or about March 26, 1996. Α 15 been appointed to represent him on a murder case. 16 At that point in time, had you represented other 17 individuals with respect to murder cases? Or was this 18 something that you were experiencing new? 19 I represented quite a few people on murder cases. 20 got off the State court appointed list in 2006, and I've 21 continued to do a substantial amount of federal criminal law 2.2 since then. Prior to 2005, I tried ten murder cases to a jury, 23 and that's where ten times a jury was impaneled. One of those 24 cases was a mistrial with Derrick McRae. One case was a

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

capital murder case which at the end of six days, the defendant

25

pled guilty to second-degree murder. One case was a capital 1 2 murder case where I was the lead attorney, one case was a 3 capital murder case where I was second, but I have tried ten. 4 I counted Derrick McRae as two, but I've tried ten murder cases 5 to a jury. 6 So, for the record, from March 26, 1996, when you 7 began representing Mr. McRae, on or about that time, you 8 represented him through the course of both of his trials in the case in question? 10 Α That's correct. 11 MR. LAU: May I approach, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Yes. 13 BY MR. LAU:: 14 Mr. Crump, can you identify the document that I 15 handed to you? 16 This is a discovery form, and it is a typical

discovery form that the district attorney's office of this district would use back in the mid-90s, and it's a discovery form stating what discovery the district attorney's office furnished to me and when they furnished it to me.

- Q And is this a true and accurate copy of the form that you have in your file from Mr. McRae's case?
 - A It is.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q And have you had an opportunity, prior to today, to review your file and to determine that it indeed contained all

the materials that are listed here on the general felony discovery report?

2.1

2.2

A No. But let me rephrase that it's actually a surprise answer. I have -- I reviewed my discovery file with very close attention to whether a number of statements which the defendants presented attorneys were furnished to me, and those particular statements were not in my file. So, I have gone through my files several times -- I went through my file at length about an hour and 45 minutes in late 2010, and then I went through them again a little over a month ago, but in going through my file -- what I'm particularly paying attention to is did the state -- did the district attorney's office furnish me those particular statements that Derrick McRae's present lawyers furnished to me. For example, I did look and see if there was a map in my file.

Q So we'll come back to that if you don't mind, but let me ask you another question off this general felony discovery form. If you look at the column entitled Faith Giving, it says 2-26-1996 in that column, do you believe that you received discovery in this case on 2-26?

- A No, I didn't.
- Q And why is it that your understanding is that you didn't receive discovery in this case on February 26, 1996?
 - A I believe I was appointed after February 26, 1996.
 - Q Do you recall the date in which Mr. McRae was

arrested?

2.2

A He might have been arrested on February 26, 1996 or thereabout. My best recollection without going through a file is that Derrick McRae was arrested at the end of February 1996.

Q So, he was arrested at the end of February 1996, based on your recollection?

A That's correct.

Q If I may Mr. Crump, can you identify the document that I've just handed you?

A This is a document signed by Mr. Crawford who was the assistant district attorney stating that they handed or furnished me discovery on the 18th day of November 1996 by placing copies in my mailbox. In my mailbox would be the mailbox in Richmond County, Clerk of Courts Office.

Q Can I take you back to Defendant's Exhibit One, the general felony discovery form, the last column that says Notes.

Is there a date on there that corresponds to this receipt of discovery --

A Yes.

Q -- or is close in time to this receipt of discovery?

A According to this discovery document, I was furnished oral statements on November 17, 1996.

Q Now, is that your handwriting?

A No.

Q On this general form of discovery?

1 Α No. 2 So, is it possible that you received this general 3 felony discovery form sometime after November 17, 1996? 4 I would believe -- it would be my belief that that's 5 That this was put in my box on or about November 17, 6 1996. 7 Q And yet you did not write that --I didn't write that. 8 9 -- on there, did you? Thank you. Now, you had an 10 opportunity to review several statements in this case? 11 That's correct. Α 12 That's correct. Before we get to those statements, 13 if I may, I'd like to hand you another document. Would you 14 mind identifying the document marked Defendant's Exhibit Three 15 for the Court. 16 This is the substance of the oral statements 17 which were attributable to Derrick McRae arising out of this 18 murder case which was furnished today by the State of North 19 Carolina, and it is dated November 17, 1996. 20 And this substance of all statements -- do you 21 recognize the handwriting? 2.2 That's my handwriting. 23 Now, is this a true and accurate copy of the 24 substance of oral statements that you --25 Α That is true and correct. It's true and correct.

Q It's true and correct. If you wouldn't mind, can you tell me what you're doing here? Can you explain to the Court why you have these handwritten notations here?

A Okay. Let me make a general answer. The State -
I'll also answer for myself, if the Court be pleased. The

State has a duty to furnish to defense counsel defendant's

written statements --

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this point. That calls for a legal conclusion and the witness is commenting on the laws as opposed to fact.

THE COURT: I'll take that into account, but I'm going to overrule the objection for the purposes of this hearing, but I'll try to separate the wheat from the chaff at the appropriate time.

A And also the substance of oral statements by the defendant, which the State intends to introduce into evidence. I take the statement furnished to me, November 17, 1996, and I'm trying to divide this up and figure out where a statement begins and where a statement ends. They have compiled all statements into one paragraph. No separation, no attribution of person one, person two, person three, and I'm trying to figure out, in representing Derrick, who made these statements and the context. And I just analyzed it.

BY MR. LAU:

1.3

2.2

Q And at that point in time, you said you're trying to

1 figure out who made the statements? 2 That's right. 3 When you were given, or asked by post conviction 4 counsel about the statements, which we'll discuss individually 5 next -- that they presented to you in post conviction, did you 6 have those statements? 7 MR. HAIGH: Objection. Vague, Your Honor, as to what 8 statements. 9 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to give you an 10 opportunity to clarify that because I'm not square on what 11 you're asking. If you can be more specific, I'll certainly 12 allow you to make that inquiry. 1.3 MR. LAU: Certainly, Your Honor. 14 BY MR. LAU: 15 Mr. Crump, you were asked by Mr. McRae's post 16 conviction lawyers to review certain statements in this case. 17 Do you recall what statements those were? 18 Α Yes. 19 And can you tell the court what statements you were 20 asked to review? 21 The -- Derrick McRae's present attorneys --Α 2.2 MR. HAIGH: I'm sorry, Your Honor, it looks like the 23 witness has brought materials up with him on the stand. 24 ask that those be removed. THE COURT: Mr. Lau, what's your position with 25

1 respect to this. I'm happy to rephrase, Your Honor. 2 MR. LAU: 3 certainly think that it's contemporary to use notes if he 4 wants to testify from them or something that he can testify 5 I would gladly rephrase with his own affidavit if the 6 Court would like me to proceed in that manner. 7 THE COURT: At this point, based on your objection, 8 if you want to look at what he's got here, I will let you do 9 that. 10 MR. HAIGH: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And we will take time to let you review 12 whatever, but then I'm going to allow him to keep them. 1.3 MR. HAIGH: Certainly. Okay. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Lau, since you may not have reviewed 15 these, you may certainly do so as well. 16 MR. LAU: Thank you. 17 (Attorneys review Mr. Crump's records.) 18 BY MR. LAU: Mr. Crump, do you still have the exhibits? 19 Q 20 I have Exhibit Number Two. 21 Q So, one and three --2.2 MR. LAU: Your Honor, we're prepared to proceed, I 23 believe, if the Court is. 24 THE COURT: All right. You've had an opportunity to 25 review all of that?

1 MR. HAIGH: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Yes, sir. You may continue. 3 BY MR. LAU: 4 I'm going to go at this a little differently if I 5 may. Mr. Crump, I'm handing you several statements 6 individually marked as Defense Exhibits 4 through 11. 7 wouldn't mind, can you identify Defendant's Exhibit Number 4 8 for the Court? 9 Defendant's Exhibit Number 4 is a statement signed by 10 Corey Robinson and dated March -- looks like March -- I'm going 11 to guess March 1, 1996. 12 Did Mr. McRae's post conviction attorneys ask you to 13 review your file for whether or not you had this statement 14 marked Defendant's Exhibit Number 4? 15 McRae's lawyers did request that of me. Α 16 And did you have those statements? Q 17 Α No, I did not. 18 Were you given this statement by the State prior to 19 Mr. McRae's trial? 20 No, I was not. 21 And how can you be so sure of that? 2.2 This is a highly material piece of evidence. 23 was the gun involved in the killing? And in my investigation, 24 I had gathered that the defendant, Corey Robinson -- the 25 defendant, Derrick McRae, had sold a gun or given a gun to

Corey Robinson. This statement is diametrically different and this statement is that Corey Robinson got this gun from Julio, which would be Julio Sturdevant, so that's an extremely material difference that I would have been aware of. Also, I talked to Corey Robinson and I went to his residence with my investigator, and as best I recall, got an evasive answer, a polite, evasive don't know anything type answer. And if I had had this, I would certainly have confronted Corey Robinson with well what was Julio's involvement. It's just the way I would have questioned if I had had this statement.

Q Now, you said through your investigation you heard of the possibility that Derrick McRae sold a gun to Corey Robinson? Is that --

A That's correct.

Q Now, did you establish that as a fact or was that based on rumor? What --

A That's just some kind of rumor and I'm talking to -don't know where I got it. I did get -- well, I don't know
where I got it, I'll say that.

Q You didn't get that from Mr. McRae, did you?

A No.

2.2

Q And Mr. McRae, during the course of your representation, steadfastly maintained his innocence throughout the period of time that you represented him?

A That's correct.

Is there another reason that you know you did not 1 receive this statement? Do you recall what it was -- the 2 policy of the District Attorney's Office -- was at the time 3 4 with respect to discovery they had turned over? 5 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object at that 6 point. 7 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to let him answer the 8 question. It's really two questions. I think the latter one 9 is the one you want him to answer? 10 MR. LAU: Yes, Your honor. I'll rephrase. 11 THE COURT: That's all right. I'll let you rephrase 12 it. 13 BY MR. LAU: 14 Did you have personal dealings with the District 15 Attorney's Office during this period of time as the defense 16 attorney? 17 Yes. Until about 2008 when I got off the State Court 18 appointed list, I just had a regular and daily interaction with all my district attorneys. 19 20 And based on your personal experience with the 21 District Attorney's Office, did you become familiar with their 2.2 practices with respect to discovery? 23 Α Yes. Can you describe what those practices were? 24 25 The practices in the mid-90s, when Ken Honeycutt Α

was district attorney, and also the practices --1 2 MR. HAIGH: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I'm going to 3 object at this point as it goes to propensity which is 4 improper. 5 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to let him testify as to 6 what his knowledge was of the procedural process. 7 Go ahead, Mr. Crump. 8 The practice then was the absolute minimum. 9 absolute minimum that the District Attorney's Office would not 10 give any more than the statute requires, I mean the North 11 Carolina General Statutes. They just give the absolute 12 minimum, the written statements of the defendants, oral

statements that they intended to introduce into evidence, and this Defendant's Exhibit Number 3. They would jumble up the oral statements where you had to -- defense attorney had to guess and speculate. I mean, they wouldn't put it on like six

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q Can you turn to Defense Exhibit Number 5 and identify what Defense Exhibit Number 5 is?

different pages or paragraphs. I mean, it's a shell game.

A Defense Exhibit 5 is a statement from Darius Lockard dated February 21, 1996.

Q And did Mr. McRae's counsel ask you to review your file to determine whether or not you received Defense Exhibit 5?

A Yes, attorneys did so. I reviewed my files and this

statement was not in my file prior to trial. 1 2 Did you receive this statement prior to trial? 3 Α No. 4 Can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 6? 5 Yes. This is a statement from Larry Parker dated 6 February 27, 1996. 7 And were you asked by Mr. McRae's counsel to review 8 your files to determine whether or not you had received 9 Mr. Parker's statement? 10 I was so asked. 11 And had you received Mr. Parker's statement? 12 Α No, I did not. 1.3 And did you receive Mr. Parker's statement prior to 14 trial? 15 No, I did not. Α 16 Had you ever seen it before Mr. McRae's counsel asked 17 you to review your file for --18 I never saw this prior to sometime in the latter part 19 of 2010. 20 And at that point, what happened in the latter part 0 21 of 2010? 2.2 At sometime, it might have been mid 2010, counsel 23 furnished me with these statements -- it might be six months 24 before -- and counsel asked me for an affidavit. I was 25 extremely sick, the sickest I've ever been in my life.

pneumonia four years ago right now. I was just unbelievably sick, and I wanted to finish out the year which my secretary — I normally give my secretary a good Christmas vacation. I wanted this out at the end of the year, and again, I spent about an hour and 45 minutes going through my file and gave an affidavit that these weren't in my file.

Q Now, your affidavit said that it was your strong opinion that these were not provided?

A It's more than a strong opinion.

Q Can you describe that. I mean, do you know with

2.2

certainty that you did not receive these from the State?

A Okay. The ones that you just asked me about, I'm as certain as anything that I didn't receive those.

Q And will you move on to Defendant's Exhibit 7. Can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 7?

A Defendant's Exhibit 7 is a statement from Serena Parker and it's dated March 31st -- no, I apologize. It's dated February 27, 1996.

Q And were you asked to review your file --

A I reviewed my file. I didn't have it in it prior to trial.

Q Did you receive it from --

A I received it from -- in sometime in 2010, as best I recall, it might have been six months, it might have been longer before that affidavit was given.

```
And if you would, can you identify for the Court
 1
 2
     Defendant's -- and we'll try to speed up a little --
 3
     Defendant's Exhibit 7?
               Well, 7 I just answered.
 4
 5
               I'm sorry, 8.
 6
               Eight is a statement from Marlen Maurice Dumas dated
 7
     February 26, 1996.
               And can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 9?
 8
 9
               Nine is a statement from Michael Anthony Ferguson
10
     dated March 1, 1996.
11
               And can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 10?
12
               Defendant's Exhibit 10 is a statement from February
13
     27, 1996 by Paul Montes Williams.
14
               And if you could, Defendant's Exhibit 11?
15
               Defendant's Exhibit 11 is a statement from Tonya, I'm
16
     not sure of the middle name, Clark and it's dated February 28,
17
     1996.
18
               Now, with respect to Defendant's Exhibits 8 through
19
     11, did you have an opportunity to review your file to
20
     determine whether or not --
21
               I did. I did not have those. I did not have
2.2
     Defendant's Exhibits 4 through 11 in my file prior to the two
23
     trials when I represented Derrick McRae before a jury in the
     Spring 1998.
24
```

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

Have you had an opportunity to review the statements?

25

A I have.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Q And having reviewed the statements, do you have a personal opinion as to whether or not they would have been material to Mr. McRae's defense?

A They are all material with different degrees of weight. Some of them I would put a lot of weight on, but they are all material because they are pieces of the puzzle, and I would question each one of them — had an investigator and we would try to talk to them. It would have made it so much easier talking to somebody if you had a statement they made to law enforcement, but some of them — they are all material, but some of them have greater weight; some of them lesser weight.

Q Is there anything that stands out when you say some of them have greater weight? Can you describe which, if anything, stands out to you about these statements?

A Well, there are four of them that are very significant. The first one that is significant is from Corey Robinson, and until I really studied — in the last month, restudied this file, I was always under the impression, from the street or somewhere —

- O Which files?
- A My file.
- 23 | 0 In this case?
 - A In this case. I was always under the impression that the evidence was, or the rumor was, that Derrick sold a gun to

Corey Robinson, and it's profoundly different that Julio
Sturdevant sold a gun to Corey Robinson, that's night and day,
so that's a profound difference. And there are three
statements that are very profound to me or very significant and
those are Larry Parker, Maurice Dumas, and Serena Parker.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q Can you explain why each of those are very profound to you or important to you?

In my past opinion, my opinion 1998, it's just -- in order for the State to get a conviction against Derrick, I think the State needs to place Derrick at the scene of the crime. That's extraordinarily important. There is no circumstantial evidence that Derrick did it. Derrick had an extraordinarily strong alibi and some way he's got to be placed at the scene of the crime for a jury to convict, and these three statements place him at the scene. Larry Parker placed him at the scene, Serena Parker places him at the scene, and Maurice Dumas places him at the scene, but they are three inconsistent statements. Larry Parker places the gunshot at 10:34. A little bit after that, Serena Parker places the gunshot at 11:30, and Maurice Dumas places the gunshot at 12:30. So, these are three people who place him at the scene, and they are three inconsistent statements. And they are so inconsistent that you have to think about well, what's the credibility of the State's evidence. Also, this was brought out on cross-examination; the State never brought this out. Ιt

was critical the time of death. When was the last time we saw Jerry Rankin alive, and he was alive -- his mother talked to him at 10:20. I know that was her testimony on the second trial.

2.1

2.2

My notes reflect that on the first trial she saw — halfway between Hamlet and Rockingham at 10:20, she then drives home and this Larry Parker is of the most — he is so certain as to the facts that he asserts that Derrick — that Jerry Rankin came to his house at 10:34 and that's almost an impossibility. It's just very critical. Here is somebody giving the State evidence that's just wrong. I mean, either he's wrong or Jerry Rankin's mother is wrong. One of them is wrong, and it goes to credibility. The other thing is during this trial, the State was trying to show motive, and the motive was Jerry Rankin comes on JFK in a red truck —

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object to nonresponsive at this point. He's commenting on the state of mind of another person as well.

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that at this point.

Mr. Crump, just let him ask his next question.

BY MR. LAU:

Q Mr. Crump, if you knew that the State's file included witnesses that gave several inconsistent statements, as you've testified to, would that have impacted how you represented Mr. McRae?

Of course it would have. 1 2 And in what way? 3 You've got to investigate Larry Parker, Maurice Dumas, and Serena Parker. And particularly, Larry Parker is 4 5 just a wrong statement. You want to know, you know, was there 6 any pressure to bear on him when he gave the statements, how 7 he's correct, and the question is how many people were 8 Larry Parker -- I want to say Larry Parker said six were there and Serena Parker said three. It might have been 10 reversed, but it's a profound difference between Derrick McRae 11 and Thurmond Nelson being involved in this crime and a group 12 being involved. There is a profound difference. 1.3 So, you would have questioned the State's 14 investigation? 15 Α Oh, yes. 16 MR. LAU: May I approach, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 BY MR. LAU: 19 Mr. Crump, I'm going to hand you what's been marked 20 Defendant's Exhibit 12. Can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 21 12 for the Court? 2.2 It's a notice that I gave to Derrick McRae, and I 23 wanted it in writing, and I wanted it witnessed to completely

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

tell my evaluation of this case to this young man. And I did

that on - I went over that with him on April 23, 1998, and his

24

25

first trial started on or about April 27, 1998.

- Q Is this a true and correct copy?
- A It's correct.

2.2

- Q If you wouldn't mind turning to Page 4 of Defendant's Exhibit 12, the notice to Mr. McRae. On the top of Page 4 it says, Forecast of Evidence?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Would you read that section of your notice for the Court?

A Yes. "In the event that Derrick McRae decides to plead not guilty and have a trial, George E. Crump, III makes the following forecast of what he thinks the State's evidence may be and also what Derrick McRae's evidence may be. The Assistant District Attorney named Scott Brewer, who will try the case and prosecute the case on behalf of the State of North Carolina, told George E. Crump, III on Monday, April 20, 1998, that he had three witnesses who will testify that Derrick McRae admitted to each of them that Derrick McRae shot and killed Jerry Rankin. Assistant District Attorney Scott Brewer also said there is one eyewitness who will testify that he observed a Derrick McRae involved in the shooting of Jerry Rankin.

Assistant District Attorney stated these four witnesses are in addition to the codefendant, Thurmond Nelson.

Based on the information and belief, it is George E. Crump, III's opinion that Thurmond Nelson did make an

incriminating statement to the police about Derrick McRae.

Based on information believed, George E. Crump, III believes
that Thurmond Nelson told the police that Derrick McRae
admitted to him that Derrick McRae shot and killed Jerry
Rankin. It is the opinion of George E. Crump, III, and this is
just a guess, that Thurmond Nelson will not testify against
Derrick McRae, but that the State will call at least a couple
of people to say Derrick McRae admitted shooting Jerry Rankin,
and the state will call an eyewitness who will testify that he
saw something incriminating relating Derrick McRae to the death
of Jerry Rankin.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Derrick McRae has consistently told George E. Crump, III, that he did not shoot Jerry Rankin. He states he was at a cookout on Friday evening, October 13th and that his brother and his brother's buddies got some liquor and that Derrick McRae was drinking and got very sick. Derrick McRae had to be helped home and Derrick McRae was asleep all evening and came home sick, remained in his house from approximately 9 or 10 pm Friday, October 13th until the next day October 14th. There are three family members who stated that they are ready to testify to the above facts on behalf of Derrick McRae. These family members are Derrick McRae's mother, brother and sister. There are four nonfamily members who were present at the cookout who state the same thing that Derrick McRae has stated. These four persons are Antoine Rush, Jeremy

Sturdevant, Jermaine Cobbs, and Renée Dockery."

Q Did Mr. Brewer name these witnesses?

A No.

1.3

2.2

Q He didn't tell you who the witnesses were?

A No.

Q If you had Defendant's Exhibits 4 through 11, would you have changed the forecast of this evidence? Would it have been included -- the information provided in the statements?

MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your Honor. It calls for speculation.

THE COURT: I'm going to let him answer if he has an opinion about that.

A It's not a speculation, but it's a little bit different answer. The forecast of evidence would actually have been substantially the same, however, the recommendation of counsel — let me back that up. In all likelihood, I would have put down the people's names. It was so important. This is a young man, 16, 17 years of age, I'd put down the people's names. What would have been different, I tend to think, is my recommendation. I recommended that Derrick McRae take a plea agreement, and I don't know that I would have made that recommendation if I had those three statements; and again, this is an impressionable 16-year-old person. I'm an experienced lawyer, and I don't know that I would have made that recommendation, or that strong recommendation. It would have

been more left to him because his case would be a much better case than I had thought it was led to believe by the Assistant District Attorney, Scott Brewer.

Also, very critical are Maurice Dumas' statement that they were arguing. If there was any way I could have made an argument on second-degree murder and maintained his argument, that would have been very critical if I could get a net underneath him.

BY MR. LAU:

1.3

2.2

Q Mr. Crump, I'm handing you what's been marked defendant's Exhibit 13. Is it possible for you to identify Defendant's Exhibit 13 for me?

A Defendant's Exhibit 13 is my time sheet, and I-- when these two cases were over, I submitted one time sheet and it's dated May 14, 1998. That was the second (inaudible), and I wanted to get paid. You're a sole practitioner -- I'm laughing, but I see I got that fee certificate in that same week. When you're a sole practitioner, you know, it's hard to ride 171 hours, I chuckle, I got that fee form in that same week for the judge to sign and get it in the mail, but this is my application and I had attached to it my time sheet.

Q Now, if you turn in your time sheet to Page 3 on 12-3-1997, it's the third row down from the top and it begins with, Visits Residence, can you find that?

A Yes.

Would you mind reading that for the Court? 1 2 Visits residences of Mrs. Rankin, Jeremy Sturdevant, 3 Tony Ferguson, attempted to locate Darius Walker. 4 Now, you previously testified that you did not 5 receive the statements of Tony Ferguson or the statements of 6 Darius Lockhart, correct? 7 Α No, I did not. 8 So, when you are visiting them on 12-3-1997, do you 9 know what their previous statements were to the police? 10 I don't know. I can't testify that I talked with 11 them on that date. If you look at the next -- what I might 12 have been doing -- it's just 45 minutes, that's a lot to do in 13 45 minutes. What I might have been doing was getting the 14 groundwork to investigate later with those two private 15 investigators. I might have talked with them or I might not 16 have, but I doubt very seriously I talked to Mrs. Rankin, but I 17 might have talked to Jeremy. I might have talked to Tony, I 18 might not have. 19 Let me ask you this. Does this change your opinion 20 of whether or not you received those statements from the State? 2.1 I didn't receive the statements. 2.2 Q Thank you. And Corey Robinson's name is also here on 23 your time sheet. Knowing that, does that change your opinion 24 as to whether or not you received Corey Robinson's statement?

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

25

Α

It just reinforces it because if I had his

statement, I wouldn't be out there on Hummingbird Drive just trying to get an evasive answer. I would have said, "Now, Corey, you told Officer such and such you bought the gun from Julio, tell me what happened."

Q Let me point your attention to one more entry on your time sheet. It's on Page 2, it's the third entry up from the bottom dated 9-30-1997.

A Yes.

2.2

Q Can you read what your activity was on 9-30-1997?

A Discussed plea negotiations with Ken Honeycutt, 30 minutes.

Q And this is an accurate description of what you did in this case?

I had on this case 171 hours and 30 minutes. I don't pad my time sheet. And I had on that date, 9-30-1997, 30 minutes on the case, and the primary thing that I did in that 30 minutes was talk with Ken Honeycutt, and I very well may have talked to him 30 minutes. Now, I didn't talk to him 35, I don't cheat myself, and also, I didn't have 20 minutes, you know, but the primary thing I did on 9-30-1997 was talk to Ken Honeycutt.

Let me say this, what my practice is. I would take files over there -- my office was right across the street. I wouldn't just take one file, count ten minutes walking over there, talk for ten minutes, walk back, and put down 30

minutes. I would take a series of files, normally, and I very well may have talked to him the whole 30 minutes or I might have been sitting there. He might have asked an assistant to go get a file, but in substance, I talked to Ken Honeycutt a significant portion, if not all, of 30 minutes on September 30, 1997.

Q Thank you. And that was about Mr. McRae's case, correct?

A Yes.

1.3

2.2

MR. LAU: If we could just have a minute, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I'll tell you what, we're going to
take about ten to 15 minutes, and I know I probably shouldn't
be commenting on the evidence at this point, but I am
encouraged to know that, at least his testimony is, that he
does not pad has time nor does he cheat himself when
reporting his time. (Laughter) We'll take about a 15 minute
break.

(Court in recess for break.)

THE COURT: All right. You may continue.

BY MR. LAU:

Q Mr. Crump, I'm going to hand you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 14. Can you identify this exhibit for the Court?

A This is a motion entitled Motion for Identity of State's Witnesses, and it is dated April 17, 1998.

Q And what was the purpose of your filing this motion?

A I didn't remember that I filed it. It's a good

3 motion though.

2.2

Q Would you mind taking a minute to review it and see if it refreshes your recollection?

A It's a good motion. It makes the allegation that the issue in the defendant's guilt or innocence will be resolved with great degree based on the credibility of State's witnesses and opportunity of State's witnesses to accurately perceive and observe events, and that it's necessary for the defendant to get up there at trial — it's necessary for the defense to investigate the backgrounds and osmosis of the State's witnesses and also makes this point, which is a good point, that the defendant had been found incompetent to stand trial on three separate occasions. So, it's of paramount importance to be able to interview the State's witnesses.

Q We've been through this. So, would you have filed this if you had the witness statements?

A I probably would have. I probably would have. A case of this nature, I probably would have. I probably would have.

Q I'm handing you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 15. Can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 15?

A This appears to be a criminal disposition of Edward Lewis Tender.

1 And during the course of your representation of 2 Mr. McRae, would you have investigated Mr. Tender's criminal 3 background? 4 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I object at this point. 5 Foundation hasn't been laid for this exhibit. 6 THE COURT: All right. I'll sustain that. 7 MR. LAU: If we could have a minute, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 BY MR. LAU: 10 Mr. Crump, are you familiar with Defendant's Exhibit 11 15? How these are produced? 12 Yes. 1.3 What takes place before something like this, 14 Defendant's Exhibit 15, before a copy is provided to counsel, 15 what would you do? 16 This is an informal bar, and all the defense 17 attorneys have a good relationship with the clerk's office. 18 We've always had a good clerk's office, and I would just go down to the clerk's office -- and I remember talking to Jane 19 20 Karicka, and I would just ask could I have Edward's record, 21 Edward Tender's record. She would run it off, and they wouldn't hesitate and certify it as a true copy. 2.2 23 Now, you recognize that stamp on these? Q 24 It's stamped a true copy. 25 And what does that stamp mean?

It means that it is true and correct. That this clerk, Yvette Popps, got these records from the clerk's office, on the clerk's computer as to Edward Lewis Tender. Is this similar to what you would receive from the clerk's office when you ask the clerk's office for a criminal record check? It is. I may or I may not get it certified. And I have no reason to doubt authenticity. If I was going to I might introduce it into evidence, I would get it certified. get the record check without it being certified. Can you just describe what type of information is reflected in these, perhaps? You generally had the -- you had the file number, you had the charge, you had, normally, the date of offense, and you had the disposition date in the sentence, just the skeleton information about a case. Can you find Case Number 96, CR 352? I can. Α I believe beginning on Page 30? Q That's correct. Α And on that record, can you identify the charge? Α Yes. It's the case of Edward Lewis Tender, and he

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

was charged with felonious breaking or entering.

the final disposition of that charge? Is that reflected in

And on what date was that charge resolved? When is

this record?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

A It is, but I don't see it right now. That disposition date is March 28, 1996.

- Q Is there another charge for File Number 96, CR 352?
- A Yes, it is. There was also an additional charge, felonious larceny after breaking and entering.
 - Q And do you see the disposition date for that charge?
- A March 28, 1996.
 - Q And is there another charge for 96 CR 352?
- 10 A Misdemeanor probation violation.
- 11 Q And you see the disposition date for charge?
- 12 A May 28, 1998.
 - Q You remember when Mr. McRae was found guilty in this case?
 - A The first trial was April 27, 1998, and I don't know whether it was a four-day trial or three day trial. Probably a four-day trial. So, you're talking about the end of April. The second trial it began, over our objections, two weeks later, and that would be on or about May 11, 1998. And I don't think the trial started, the second on the second trial until the second day maybe in the afternoon, maybe about the lunchtime and my fee form, which I remember well, I turned in a fee form on May 14, 1998. So, it would be my educated guess that that second trial ended May 14, 1998.
 - Q You wouldn't turn in your fee form until the

completion of the trial?

2.2

A No, I wouldn't, but I would be -- again, is sole practitioner, by myself, you need these fees, and I would -- here's what's critical is, I was trying to get to the judge before an out-of-town judge left, not to come back for a month or six weeks. So, and normally a judge may hang around for a couple of hours, and if my fee form is May 14, 1998, a very educated guess is that the case ended -- it says date of disposition May 14, 1998.

- Q I was going to say can you turn to Page 7, and does that refresh your recollection on when it was that Mr. McRae's case ended?
- A May 14, 1998.
 - Q Thank you. Can you find Offense Number 96 CR 424?
- A Yes, I can.
- Q If you wouldn't mind, can I back you up to that last page?
- A Okay.
 - Q Does this record also indicate who is the prosecutor for the State with regards to that misdemeanor probation violation?
 - A Well, the Assistant DA has initials SB. And in all probability that would be Scott Brewer.
 - Q Now, if you can go to the 96 -- did you know any ADA within the district that had the same initials SB?

1 It's conceivable there was somebody else. 2 think of anybody with a S. You have Sophia Crawford, and 3 Jonathan Hicks, Michael Parker --4 So, no one comes to mind? 5 No one comes to mind. Let's move on to Record Number 96 CR 424. 6 7 read the charge? 8 Obtaining property by false pretense. 9 And its disposition date? Q 10 March 28, 1996. Α 11 And is there another charge with the same file 12 number? 1.3 Misdemeanor probation violation. Α 14 And do you have the disposition date of that offense? Q 15 May 28, 1998. Α 16 Does it list the ADA who handled the misdemeanor 17 probation violation? 18 The ADA had the initials SB. 19 If you don't mind going back to Page 2. I'm sorry 20 Page 3, which is the first record 96 CR 352 for felonious 21 breaking and entering. That was disposed of on 3-28-1996. 2.2 Does that list the initials of a prosecutor there? 23 Α The initials SB. 24 And that was resolved in March of 1996, correct? 25 Α That's correct.

1 And turning the page to the felony larceny, does that 2 list the prosecutor as well? 3 Α SB. 4 Thank you. And if you would, returning to the first 5 charge for File Number 96 CR 424, which was the obtaining 6 property by false pretenses disposed of on March 28, 1996, is 7 there a prosecutor listed there? 8 SB. Α 9 SB? Q 10 S as in Scott, B as in Brewer. 11 Thank you very much. Mr. Crump, I'm handing you 12 what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 16. Can I ask you to 13 identify Defendant's 16? 14 Yes, sir. Criminal record check for Thurman Nelson. And do you recognize the stamp at the bottom 15 16 right-hand corner? 17 Α Yes. 18 And what does that stamp indicate? 19 It indicates this is a true and correct copy of these 20 matters obtained of these convictions for Thurman Nelson. 21 Now, when Mr. Nelson testified in Mr. McRae's case, 2.2 did you conduct a criminal record or criminal history on 23 Mr. Nelson or did you ask the clerk's office, as you previously 24 testified, for Mr. Nelson's criminal record? 25 I cannot remember running a record check on Thurman

1 Nelson. 2 Okay. 3 I just can't remember. I'm sure I asked him what he 4 had been tried and convicted of, that would be an educated 5 quess. 6 Okay. Now, look at Defendant's Exhibit 16. 7 turn your attention to Page 4, which is 96 CR 9369. Can you 8 identify the charge with respect to 96 CR 9369? 9 Can I have just a minute. 10 Q Sure. 11 What's the question? Α 12 Q Can you identify the charge? 1.3 The charge is a misdemeanor possess stolen goods. Α And does this indicate an offense date? 14 Q 15 The offense date was November 27, 1996. Α 16 And do you understand that to be after the arrest of 17 Mr. McRae and Mr. Nelson? 18 Yes. It is. 19 It is after. But sometime after Mr. Nelson was 20 arrested, as a codefendant in the case with Mr. McRae, he was 21 then cited for possession of stolen goods? 2.2 Α That's right. 23 And do you see the disposition date here? Q 24 The disposition date was January the 9th 1997. Α 25 Would it have been important to you knowing Q

Mr. Tender's record at the time he testified? 1 2 Is this Mr. Tender or Mr. Nelson? 3 I'm sorry. Mr. Nelson. Thank you. 4 This is -- I respectfully disagree with Judge 5 Stillman, and I was aware of this, and what was amazing to me 6 was that a young man is charged with murder, commits a 7 subsequent offense and just stays out on bond. 8 Let me go back if you would, with respect to 96 CR 9 9369, does the CR have any meaning to you? 10 I believe that all files in Richmond County start off 11 with a CR, probably throughout the state. When the file 12 reaches a Superior Court level, an 'S' would be added and it 13 would be CRS. 14 Now, if I ask you to turn the page, would you mind Q 15 turning the page and can you read the file number on the next 16 page? 17 You have a CRS. 18 And it's 96 CRS 9369, right? Q 19 That's correct. Α 20 And can you tell me the charge there? 0 21 Here you have a felony possessed stolen goods, felony 2.2 possessed stolen goods, so these are felonies. 23 Q And what's the disposition date? 24 The disposition date here is August 26, 1998. 25 Q And the offense date?

- A The offense date was the same, November 27th 1996.
- Q So, on November 27, 1996, the offense is committed and that's after the individuals are arrested and this is resolved before or after Mr. McRae's trial? Do you know?

A It appears that Thurman Nelson was charged with three offenses occurring on November 27, 1996. Two of them were felonies. One of them was a misdemeanor, and the misdemeanor was the misdemeanor possession of stolen goods. It's a typical practice on the misdemeanor for attorneys in this district to stipulate — to plead not guilty, stipulate the guilt, the judge to find guilt on the misdemeanor and appeal it up, and that way you have all three pending in Superior Court and normally, one or more of those is going to wash out. It's going to be disposed of one way or the other.

- Q So, after that's appealed through the Superior Court, then it's set once again on the court calendar?
 - A It would go on the Superior Court calendar.
 - Q And it wasn't resolved until --
 - A It was not resolved until August 26, 1998.
- Q Thank you. If I could move you forward to 96 CRS 6547, which is Page 9 in the record.
 - A Okay.

2.2

- Q Can you describe the charge on 96 CRS 6547?
- A The charge is carrying a concealed gun.
 - Q And do you see the offense date?

August 24, 1996. 1 2 Now, is that before or after you understand 3 Mr. Nelson to have been arrested for first-degree murder? 4 That would have been after. 5 And do you see the disposition date with respect to 6 this charge? 7 The disposition date on this is January 15, 1997 8 which is before --Are you looking at CRS -- 96 CRS? 9 10 No. I'm looking at CR. If I turn over to CRS, you 11 got a disposition date later, August 26, 1998. 12 So, that would be the same --1.3 It's probably the scenario that the misdemeanors are 14 someway appealed up to Superior Court. 15 So, the file resolution was in Superior Court? Q 16 That's right. In August, 1998. 17 And if I could direct your attention to 97 CRS 1880. 18 Have you found that record? 19 Α Yes. 20 Can you tell me what -- can you tell me which charge 21 is listed under 97 CRS 1880? 2.2 Drive left of center. 23 Now, is there a second charge associated with that 24 file anywhere on the next page? 25 Carrying a concealed weapon.

COURT REPORTER

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM

What's the offense date of that charge? 1 2 March 7, 1997. 3 Is that after Mr. Nelson was arrested for 4 first-degree murder along with Mr. McRae? 5 That's correct. 6 What's the final disposition date on 97 CRS 1880? 7 Α August 26, 1998. Is that after Mr. McRae's trial? 8 0 That's after. 9 10 You practiced in this district for a long time, 11 haven't you? 12 I have. 1.3 Is it the common practice to have someone out on bond 14 for first-degree murder picked up twice while carrying a 15 concealed weapon? 16 Let me backtrack. I might have made a mistake. 17 was arguing -- it might have been on the two carrying a 18 concealed weapon charges -- I was trying to get buys, and it 19 might have been on those two charges that I was arguing rather 20 than the shoplifting case, but --2.1 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this 2.2 It calls for speculation and that goes to somebody 23 else's state of mind. 24 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that objection. You 25 don't need to answer that, Mr. Crump.

1 MR. LAU: If we may. 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MR. LAU: Defense has no further questions, Your 4 Honor. We would move to admit Defense Exhibits 1 through 16 5 into the court record. 6 THE COURT: All right. Let those exhibits be 7 admitted. 8 (Defense Exhibit Nos. 1 through 16 were 9 admitted.) 10 THE COURT: Cross-examination. 11 MR. HAIGH: Yes, sir. 12 CROSS EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. HATGH: 14 Now, Mr. Crump, you mentioned that you did ten murder 15 cases up through 2005. At the time of Mr. McRae's murder case, 16 how many murder cases have you done at that point? 17 I was trying so many murder cases that -- basically I 18 tried murder cases in the 1990s. I tried a capital murder 19 case December 1996, where I was a lead attorney, and that was 20 after I got appointed to this case, and he's on death row right 21 now. I then was second chair in a capital murder case in 2.2 February of 1997. The lead attorney was in another case, and I 23 was primarily gathering the evidence on that case. I then 24 tried a case by myself, I think, in April of 1997, and then I 25 tried, a year later, I tried Derrick the first time and Derrick

the second time. I tried five murder cases in 18 months. 1 2 Okay. Now, you were only lead counsel on two murder 3 cases prior to Derrick McRae's first case, isn't that right? 4 That is not right. 5 I'm sorry. So, how many were you lead counsel in 6 prior to Derrick McRae's case? 7 Without being smart, I had so many murder cases. 8 don't know how many, and the DA's office so many times would 9 just charge somebody with capital murder, and I had quite a few 10 murder cases that were pled out. They were capital murder 11 cases that weren't true capital murder cases. There was 12 another case -- this is kind of interesting, I just thought 13 I tried a capital murder case in front of a jury about this. 14 that I'm not even counting, you know, they set it up as a 15 capital murder case, then it comes back second degree. 16 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to call 17 nonresponsive at this point. 18 Can you just answer the question in terms of how many Q 19 cases were you lead counsel on prior to this that actually went 20 to trial?

A It would be two.

Q Okay. Now, with your experience, presumably, you had a methodology by which you would keep track of the discovery that came to you by the State in each case?

A Yes.

21

2.2

23

24

25

Did you have a ledger that you would use or something 1 2 of that --3 Α No. No. 4 What was your methodology? 5 I have a six part folder, and it's going to be in one 6 of those sections. 7 Okay. But you don't have a primary document that you would list when you received each document? 8 9 No. 10 So, it's fair to say that you don't have any record of what you received when? 11 12 I have an excellent record. 1.3 Can you please share with the State your record? 14 I have a six part folder. In one section I have my 15 work file, one section I have motions and orders, another 16 section I have discovery, then I have another section mental 17 health, then I have another section first trial and second 18 trial. It's just in a six part folder. 19 Right. But you're saying that you don't have any 20 record of when you got each piece of discovery from the State, 21 do you? 2.2 Α I had no reason to --23 It's a yes or no question, sir? Q 24 THE COURT: All right. Don't be argumentative. 25 Can you answer that yes or no? Do you have a record

of when --1 The answer is yes for what Sophia Crawford gave to 2 3 She's Assistant DA. I got it Xeroxed, it's in my file, and I had no reason to disbelieve Sophia Crawford. 5 BY MR. HAIGH: 6 So, the only record that you have is something that's 7 prepared by somebody else, is that right? Yes or no, sir. 8 That's substantially true. 9 Thank you. Q 10 MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, may I approach. 11 THE COURT: Certainly. 12 BY MR. HAIGH: 1.3 I'm showing you what's previously been marked for 14 identification purposes as State's Exhibit 1. Do you recognize that? 15 16 I do. 17 Q Have you seen that before? 18 I have. Α 19 And that is -- can you please identify that for the 20 Court? 21 This is a written statement by Thurman Nelson dated 22 March 1, 1996. 23 And do you recall that statement being entered into 24 evidence in Mr. McRae's first trial, April 27, 1998? 25 I assume it was, but I don't -- I make that PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

1 assumption.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 2, and that's front and back, sir. Do you recognize that?

A I don't know that I've seen this before. I didn't sign -- it's a -- State's Exhibit Number 2 is an evidence log that the clerk signs just verifying what was introduced into evidence, and it shows that Thurman Nelson's statement was introduced into evidence.

- Q Okay. And the date on that is what? May 1, 1998?
- A Where? It's the date released May 1, 1998.
- Q Okay. Now, you were the attorney of record in the first case, is that correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q So, you were, obviously, made aware of Mr. Nelson's statement on that date if you hadn't received it before, isn't that right?
- A In the second trial.
- 18 Q Let me back up, sir. This is the --
 - A I don't have a transcript of the first trial. I do have a transcript of the second trial. In the second trial, I cross examined Thurman based on his statement. I obviously had the statement in the second trial, and I assume -- I have no reason to believe I didn't have the statement in the first trial.
 - Q Okay. Now, in looking over your file for preparation

for today, did you find Mr. Nelson's statement in your file? 1 2 It was not in my file, and that was not in my file, 3 but I was furnished a copy. I either -- I may not have 4 received a file, but during my representation of Derrick McRae, 5 I had this in my hand, and I reviewed it and then cross 6 examined Thurman. It might have been that I just put it back. 7 Q Okay. But you are speculating on that. You really 8 don't know one way or the other? 9 That's right. That's right. 10 Now, what, if any, witness statements or copies of 11 witness statements did you have in your file that were provided 12 by the State? 1.3 I had a one page defense copy substance oral 14 statements. That's what I had. 15 So, you didn't have any individual statements 16 whatsoever, is that your testimony? 17 That's my testimony. Furnished from the State. 18 I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 19 3, and now, the statement of Maurice Dumas that you testified 20 to on direct, this is the statement you are referring to, is 21 that right? 2.2 Rephrase the question. 23 Okay. On direct examination, you referred to a 24 statement provided by Ms. Dumas, isn't that right? Mr. Dumas,

25

I apologize?

- A I call him Maurice Dumas.
- Q Okay. And this is the same statement, is that right?
 - A I assume it is.

1.3

2.2

- Q Okay. Now, I want to start with the first page, fourth line, I'm sorry, fifth line from the bottom. I'm going to read that and please tell me if it's correct. 'Derrick had what looked like a .380 handgun.' Did I state that correctly?
 - A That's what this statement says.
- Q Okay. Now, on the second page, I want to start about seven or eight lines down with 'Derrick walked on the right-hand side of that line.' Do you see where that starts?

MR. LAU: Objection, Your Honor. The purpose of this is to try to establish the veracity of the statement inculpatory evidence. The purpose of this hearing is whether or not Mr. Crump received the statement or not. It's not a matter of what's necessarily within the statement, inculpatory to Mr. McRae.

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, on direct, one of the things that was an issue, clearly, is that how Mr. Crump would have responded to having these statements, and he said that they were material. He already testified on their nature.

Moreover, when you're looking at an alleged Brady violation, one of the things to consider is, you know, A. Whether it's inculpatory and what light it puts the case in should those have been provided. So, this is absolutely relevant to what

Mr. McRae's counsel is alleging in this case.

THE COURT: I agree with you, and the objection is overruled. Continue. One thing I am going to ask though, if you intend to offer into evidence these State's Exhibits, it's been very helpful to me with the defendant handing up the exhibits as they were introduced so that I could read along with you or look at it for myself. So, after we take a break, I know you may not have copies now, but if you can do that during our lunch break for any exhibit you intend to offer, it's just helpful for me to have those up here.

MR. HAIGH: And Your Honor, for the record, this is Defendant's Exhibit 8. That's what we're looking at.

THE COURT: Right. I put that together, but it would simply be easier and better for me when reviewing all this if I could have copies. If you don't intend to offer them into evidence that's fine. If you're just going to ask him about them and go no further than that, I don't really need them, but if you intend to offer them into evidence I need to see them.

MR. HAIGH: All right.

BY MR. HAIGH:

1.3

2.2

- Q Now, sir, were you able to identify the line which I --
 - A I did, sir.
 - Q Okay. So, 'Derrick walked up on the porch and he was

pointing his gun and saying, 'Man, I will shoot you. I will shoot you, white boy.' I then heard someone say, 'I'm not bothering you niggers.' I saw fire come from the gun when it went off. After four or five seconds, a second shot was fired. The first shot came from the gun Derrick had in his hand because it was fired from on the porch of the house, and the second one was fired from Thurman, and he was standing on the ground below the porch. After the second gunshot, I heard Derrick say, 'Let's go.' Derrick and Thurman ran down the hill that is in front of the house and started running toward me, and they still had the guns in their hands. I ran into the woods and hid because I was scared they were going to shoot me.' Did I read that correctly correct, sir?

A You did. You did.

Q Okay. If you would look on the third page, middle of the fourth line and I'm going to start with the Derrick said.

'Derrick said, "We know you saw what we did last night, and if you say anything, we will kill you too just like we did him."

Did I read that correctly?

A You did.

2.2

Q Okay. Now, on direct you indicated that Mr. Dumas' statement was material and very important to you, is that right?

A That is correct.

Q Now, understand -- it's fair to say that this witness

```
inculpates Mr. McRae should the statement be true, isn't that
 1
 2
     right?
 3
               That's correct.
 4
               So, you said earlier that it wouldn't have a
 5
     bearing -- you said the case was better if you had been aware
 6
     of the statements previously, right?
 7
               It would have been better, yes, much better to defend
 8
     it.
 9
               Okay. So, you're saying that you would have
10
     considered putting Mr. Dumas on the stand to discredit Nelson
11
     when he inculpates McRae so clearly?
12
               Can I have a minute?
1.3
               Yes.
          Q
14
                    I would not have called Maurice Dumas to
          Α
15
     testify.
16
          Q
               Okay.
17
          Α
               But can I answer my question why it's material?
18
               Well, I think you already did?
          Q
19
               I haven't completely answered it.
          Α
20
               Well, we'll wait for redirect for that.
          0
                                                         Thank you.
2.1
               MR. LAU: Your Honor, I think the witness should have
2.2
       the opportunity to complete his answer.
23
               THE COURT:
                           I have a feeling that somewhere along the
24
       line he's going to be asked to follow up on that.
25
               Mr. Crump, why don't you go ahead and explain your
                    PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM
```

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

answer while it's fresh in your mine and mine.

2.2

A Somewhere I read that -- it might have been the state's synopsis that there was an argument, that they were arguing. That Derrick McRae was arguing with Jerry Rankin, and that's extraordinarily important when you're talking about an execution, first degree murder, where somebody has smoked crack cocaine and has just passed out and somebody goes and executes him or where there is an argument and you don't know what the other side said because you're getting into second-degree murder.

So, I would not have called Maurice Dumas to testify, but I would have investigated, and I would want to know everything he saw, you know, the distance and you want to compare it with Larry Parker who is two hours earlier in time, and Serena Parker who is one hour -- you've got three inconsistent statements. But no, I would not call Maurice Dumas to testify.

Q Is it fair to say the risk would be too great in terms of what would come out?

A Unless he told me that the officers put words in my mouth, et cetera, et cetera. You just wouldn't do it.

Q Now, on the second-degree murder part, my understanding is your analysis is based on the fact that there was an argument between the deceased and Mr. McRae, isn't that right?

1 That's right. 2 Now, there's nobody's testimony that places the 3 argument on or about the same time as the execution, is there? 4 There is not a single witness that does that. 5 Somewhere I read --6 We can give you time, if you want to look. 7 Α Okay. 8 THE COURT: Why don't we give him about an hour and 9 20 minutes? 10 THE WITNESS: How about you give me about 30 seconds? 11 THE COURT: We're going to go ahead and break for 12 lunch. 1.3 THE WITNESS: I got you. 14 THE COURT: All right. We'll be in recess, Sheriff, till 2:00. 15 16 THE BAILIFF: Court will be in recess till two p.m. 17 (Lunch break was taken at 12:30 p.m.) 18 (Court resumes at 2:00 p.m.) 19 THE COURT: All right. Let the record reflect that 20 the defendant is present and all counsel is present. 21 I believe that you had asked a question. 2.2 And I don't recall, Mr. Crump, if you recall the 23 question that was asked or if you would like that repeated. 24 THE WITNESS: I basically recall the question. 25 question was whether Maurice Dumas stated in his statement that

Derrick and Jeremy Rankin were arguing. I read his statement 1 2 and that's not in there, but I was furnished a synopsis of the 3 case when his present lawyers furnished me with the statements, and in that synopsis by law enforcement, they just summarized 5 that Dumas said he heard Jerry and Derrick arguing. 6 BY MR. HAIGH: 7 0 And so -- -8 That's where I got that from. 9 So, do you have additional information now in front 10 of you that you didn't have previously that we looked at? Is 11 that something that you received after I was able to look at 12 the documents in front of you? 1.3 I had it present right here. When I was testifying 14 before lunch, I had this and it was in my group. 15 MR. HAIGH: May I approach, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Yes. 17 All right. So, this is not -- what you're referring 18 to is not reflected in Mr. Dumas' statement, but this is 19 another document that you're referring to, is that right? 20 This is the law enforcement -- law enforcement's 21 characterization of what Mr. Dumas told me. 2.2 Q So, something prepared by someone other than 23 Mr. Dumas, is that right? 24 That's right. Α 25 Now, I think where we left off before the break is

you indicated that you were familiar with the statement that raised the issue of murder second in that there was an argument at the time of the shooting. Now, were you able to locate that statement in the notes that are provided there? That was what I was referring to in Maurice Dumas' statement. But doesn't give the --It doesn't say that, but it does say that they were -- implies that they were speaking and there was an exchange between the two and then the law enforcement characterized it as an argument. But there's no temporal indication of whether the argument and the shooting took place at the same time, is there? That's the only logical conclusion is it took place at the same time. I don't think that Maurice Dumas saw them on 17 two separate occasions. So, you are making a logical leap there, is that fair Q

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

to say?

I don't consider it a leap. I consider that a reasonable inference.

Can you point in Mr. Dumas' statement where it references argument?

That's the reason I read it. If I can have a minute, I'm going to go back to the State's -- okay, this is

Defendant's Exhibit 8. There's a conversation there on Page 2 1 2 on Defendant's Exhibit 8. 'Derrick walked up on the porch and 3 he was pointing his gun and saying, "Man, I will shoot you, I will shoot you, white boy." I then heard someone say, "I'm not 4 5 bothering you, " and then the N-word. I think that's a 6 reasonable inference, taking the view of the defendant's 7 lawyer, that that's an argument and the law enforcement 8 likewise made a reasonable inference that they were arguing. 9 So, in your opinion, the years that you've been a 10 defense attorney, you believe that those two statements are sufficient for a murder second instruction? 11 12 The judge in this case at the second trial --1.3 That's a yes or no question. Q 14 In your opinion, regardless of what the THE COURT: 15 judge may have done, do you have an opinion? 16 Yes. It's sufficient. 17 BY MR. HAIGH: 18 And Mr. Crump, do you have what's been marked as 19 Defendant's Exhibit 7 up there? 20 Yes. 21 I want to read you a couple of these portions here and see if I have this right. The first being in the second 2.2 23 paragraph, seven or eight lines down on the first page in the 24 middle it says, 'A few minutes later'.

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

I have you.

25

Α

Q Okay. "A few minutes later this -- and then it's indecipherable -- guy named Jerry Rankin walked up to Derrick McRae -- and again, indecipherable -- him for a rock, when Derrick gave Jerry the rock -- blank -- gave Derrick some money he had folded up in his hand.' Does it appear that I entered that correctly into the record?

A You did.

2.2

Q Now, about four or five lines down at the very right hand column, 'A few' do you see where I'm referring to?

A Yes.

Q All right. 'A few minutes later Derrick unfolded the money that Jerry had gave him and said, "Naw, that motherfucker cheated me. Nobody cheats me." Jeremy said, "Let's go and blast that motherfucker" and Derrick said, "Yeah, let's go kill him," and then, Julio said, "No man, let it go" to Derrick.

Derrick, "No. I'm going to blast him." Julio then said to Derrick, "Well, do what you got to do," and about 11:15 p.m.

Derrick, Jeremy, and Thurman ran down towards JFK' -- and then there's something that's unclear, and it says, 'The same way that Jerry had gone. At or around 11:30 p.m. I heard one gunshot, about ten minutes later I saw what looks to be

Derrick, Jeremy, and Thurman running back up towards my house.

When they got to my yard, they stopped and bent over resting their arms on their knees.' Is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q All right. Now, further down the same page probably about five lines from the bottom, in from the left and down slightly, 'I heard Johnny,' do you see where I'm referring to?

Q All right. 'I heard Johnny ask Derrick, "Did you get rid of the gun?" And Derrick told Johnny that he gave it to Thurman to throw in the river. I then came out of my front door and Derrick said, "You Bitch, I know you know what happened, and if you tell, I'll kill your ass." About three days later, I was at my mother's house on JFK Drive and Derrick got into an argument with my mother about what I saw. Derrick said, "Yeah, I'll kill ya'll ass just like I did that white boy Jeremy." He then told me that the night doesn't have eyes. A few days later Derrick began cutting the screens on my windows, and he set a fire on my front porch.' Did I put that into the record correctly?

A You did.

Yes.

2.2

Q Okay. Now, again, this is a statement from Serena Parker and this is a statement that you testified on direct that the case would be much better had you known about this witness?

A That's right.

Q All right. Now, it's fair to say that this statement inculpates Mr. McRae, isn't that right?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. Now, would you have put this witness on the stand knowing that this would be the scope of their testimony?

A No.

1.3

2.2

Q All right. Now, Mr. Crump, do you have what's been previously marked as Defense Exhibit 6 in front of you?

A Yes.

Q All right. If you could look at that please starting in the second paragraph about eight lines down with, 'Jerry asked Derrick'. It's in the left margin.

A Okay.

Q Okay. 'Jeremy asked Derrick, "Do you have any cocaine?" And Derrick replied, "Yeah, do you have the money?" Jeremy replied, "Hell, yeah, I've got money. I'm not on welfare." At this time I told them to leave him alone and that I wasn't going to have them fighting in my yard. A few minutes later the six black males left walking up the sidewalk that goes in front of my house. They were headed towards Palisade Circle. After they left, Jerry asked me what time it was, and I told him it was 10:34 p.m. He told me that he was afraid of those guys and that he was going to his brother's house who lives near the skating rink on Rockingham Road. At about 10:45 p.m. I heard a gunshot coming from Palisade pool area. About two or three minutes later, after the gunshot, I saw the same six black males running from the pool area real hard.

The only one that I recognized that was running was

Derrick, Tony, and Jeremy. I heard someone say, "Pick up the damn gun," and the black male that was wearing a blue jacket picked up the gun and they all ran behind the apartments towards Rockingham Road. Did I state that correctly?

A Yes.

1.3

2.2

Q Okay. Now, you indicated that this was also an important statement for you?

A It is.

Q Okay. And that was based solely on -- well, let me ask you this. One of the reasons it's valuable in your mind is the specific times given by this witness, is that right?

A That's one element.

Q Okay. And what are the other ones that make you think this is valuable?

A In neither this statement nor Serena Parker's statement, is there any mention of the red truck and, you know, the State perceived it as to a motive to the murder. That Jeremy Rankin came up JFK in a red truck. The transaction took place at the red truck or the dissented red truck. That Derrick was given fake money and then Jerry Rankin sped off in the red truck. Neither this statement nor Serena Parker's statement has anything about the red truck in it. Okay, that's critical.

Also, in this statement -- the question I would ask myself is, if Derrick McRae pushed Jerry Rankin and they have a

fight, why would he thereafter shoot and kill him. And then you have the six men, that's a lot of people that somebody on the street says Derrick was involved. Where there is a presence there which doesn't rise to the level of aiding and abetting. So, all those are critical factors.

Q Okay. So, I want to make sure I understand -
A And also, the timing -- either he's wrong or Jerry Rankin's mother is wrong or he is tremendously mistaken.

Q All right. So, just to make sure I understand your

testimony correctly, the issues that you perceive give this

statement value are the temporal issue, the time issue.

A That's right.

1.3

2.2

Q The fact that it doesn't directly inculpate Mr. McRae in that it only provides that he participated, but may not have been the shooter?

A Well, I don't think you have anything on here about him being the shooter.

Q Right. That's my point, that it doesn't say that he's the shooter, right?

A That's right.

Q Okay. And the fact that there is an absence of detail with regard to a red truck?

- A Well, I think it's contrary to the red truck.
- Q Is there any other vehicle listed there?
- A No, but, yeah, he walked up. You just don't see the

1 | red truck.

1.3

2.2

Q All right. But it's fair to say that if you exit a vehicle, you walk to wherever you're going even to meet people, isn't that right?

A No, because --

Q So, you're saying that --

THE COURT: Let him finish his answer.

MR. HAIGH: All right. I'm sorry.

A I just think the red truck was very important, and when his mother talked to him, it's brought out that he was on foot so, the implication — the inference I would make in defending him is that somebody let him out in that neighborhood and he's walking and that it wasn't what Thurmond Nelson says or other people say about a red truck it's just a bogus.

Q Well, there's -- I mean, there is no allegation anywhere in the testimony or statements that Rankin's mother was present for any of this, is there? Can you please point in those statements or in the record where that's provided that Mr. Rankin's mother had personal information regarding the events of this case?

A Yes. On Page 183 of the second trial, defense counsel asked when it was that she saw her son at Campus Courts — this is just an extraordinary critical issue because we get into parameters of the time and date, and she said that she saw her son about 10:20 because she left him; she went to

her house and called her daughter-in-law and her 1 2 daughter-in-law said it was 10:30. 3 But that's not at the place. That was at Corpus Campus Courts, right? 4 5 That's about 3 miles away. 6 Right. But she wasn't on site of the actual drug 7 deal, isn't that right? One area of cross-examination is -- you're assuming 8 there is a drug deal -- that one area of our cross-examination 9 10 was, you know, defense was trying to poke holes in this red 11 truck, and she indicated the red truck had been parked at their 12 house for about two weeks. He hadn't driven it in about two 13 weeks. 14 All right. But she doesn't have any personal Q 15 knowledge of what happened at the scene of the drug deal, isn't 16 that right? 17 Of the alleged drug deal. She was not on -- there is 18 no evidence that -- I believe her name was Janet Rankin was on JFK Drive or Palisade Circle. I don't think there's any 19 20 evidence of that. 21 Thank you. Sir, if you could look at what's been 2.2 marked as Defense Exhibit 4. Do you have that there? 23 Α I do. 24 All right. Now, here's another statement and that's

25

the statement of Corey Spencer Robinson, is that right?

That's correct. 1 2 Now, this is another one that you said was material in terms of the value, is that right? 3 4 It is. 5 Okay. Now, everything in this statement is hearsay, 6 isn't it? 7 Let me read this. 8 Yeah, please. 9 You are correct. My understanding is that this can 10 come into evidence is -- Julio is going to have to be there to 11 tie it into Derrick McRae. 12 And other than a first name, there is no other 13 identification provided for Julio, is that right? 14 I think everybody knows who Julio is. Julio 15 Sturdevant, very talkative young man. As best I can recall, 16 Julio is Marnell McRae's boyfriend. That's my educated guess. 17 That's my best memory. 18 Q Okay. 19 But he was involved -- very talkative, very polite, 20 there is only one Julio. 21 Okay. So, you communicated with Mr. Robinson then, 2.2 is that right? Prior to trial? 23 Α I did. 24 Okay. And you said he was very polite, very

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

25

talkative.

A No. I didn't say that.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Q You didn't say he was very talkative? I think that's what you -- if you go back on the record, I think your testimony was he's a very talkative young man.

A As I understood, you asked about Julio, and I said that Julio was a very talkative young man.

- Q Okay. Now, you're aware of the relation that Julio had to members of the McRae's family, is that right?
 - A As best I recall, he was Marnell McRae's boyfriend.

MR. LAU: Your Honor, I would object to these questions involving stuff outside of these statements which is just additional material that I believe, outside of this record, is trying to establish that perhaps in some speculative world, these inconsistencies in the statements could be reconciled. It's asking questions about relationships with individuals and about, you know, could Ms. Rankin have seen a red truck. All these questions are trying to introduce facts that aren't in the record here to try and bolster these statements which are, as you will see later through additional witnesses, entirely inconsistent with one another, and we would object to any questions going forward along those lines.

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, the witness testified to the value and materiality of these statements. At issue before the Court in this case is, should these statements had not

been turned over, what value did they have, how would they have affected the case, and what I'm trying to figure out is, based upon these statements and Mr. Crump's activities in the case, how they would have affected the outcome. How it would have affected how he prepared for the case and carried out the case which he testified on direct on. So, I think it's fair game.

THE COURT: I think both of you have taken advantage of the wide latitude that you've allowed one another and that I've allowed to go into these matters and to attempt to get into Mr. Crump's thought process as he now testifies looking back at this, and I'm going to allow you to proceed as you have been. That objection is overruled.

BY MR. HAIGH:

1.3

2.2

- Q Now, you said earlier that you met with Julio and talked with him about any potential knowledge that he may have had about the events, is that right?
 - A I did.
- Q All right. So, arguably, you even had better information and that it was firsthand as opposed to this guy, right?
 - A No, I didn't.
 - Q You said you spoke to him directly, right?
- 24 A Oh, yes --
- 25 Q So, wouldn't that be firsthand information?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Yes, but --
- Okay, thank you.

THE COURT: It's not quite that simple, you ask a question, you get to hear the full answer.

Go right ahead, Mr. Crump?

A key element is the gun and the murder weapon, and my information somewhere, right or wrong, is that Derrick sold the gun to Corey Robinson. I went to Corey Robinson and he was polite, but not talkative, and if I had his statement that he bought the gun from Julio, I'm going to two people. I'm going back to Corey Robinson and confront him with the statement. Did he make the statement? Was it true? Why did he make it? What were the circumstances? And then I'm going to Julio and say, "Who took it? I'm trying to help Derrick. I got to have What happened? Did you sell a gun to Corey the truth. Robinson?" So, I mean, it would certainly -- it affects my investigation.

- To the extent that you weren't able to follow up on Q that particular statement, is that right?
 - That's right.
- Okay. Now, just out of curiosity, what did Julio share with you about his knowledge of that night?
- Not much. He -- Julio, he's a very talkative person who doesn't say much, and I think Julio is probably the one who went to the liquor store, if I had to make a guess. You know,

bought the liquor that afternoon and, you know, pretty much just confirmed, as best I recall, he's at the cookout, but I don't have it in my notes a specific thing about Julio. So, you took interviews of different people, but didn't prepare notes on what those interviews entailed? They were sketchy notes. It might be like a one paragraph, something like that, but basically, Julio gave that, you know, gave the liquor store, have a cookout, but I don't have a detailed statement that I put him into bed, et cetera, et cetera, tucked him in, that type of thing. Okay. Now, I'd like you to take a look at what's Q been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 10. Do you have that there? T do. I'm going to read the second paragraph. 'About three days after Jerry Rankin was killed, a friend of mine named Jeremy Sturdevant told me that Derrick McRae and Thurmond 17 Nelson killed Jerry Rankin. Jeremy also told me that Derrick McRae is the one that shot Jerry and that Thurmond was just with him.' Is that correct? That's correct. All right. Now, in the second paragraph, you go down probably about the third or fourth line from the bottom in the right column it starts with 'Derrick.' Do you see that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

I do.

Α

Q

All right. That says, 'Derrick had a black in color

what looked like .380 handgun.' Is that right? 1 2 That's correct. 3 Okay. Let's take a look at Defense Exhibit 9, 4 please. Do you have that there, sir? 5 I do. 6 All right. Now, at the last line of the second Q 7 paragraph, does that say, 'Derrick told me that he had sold the 8 gun to Corey Robinson'? 9 That's correct. 10 And then middle of the second paragraph, close to the Q 11 left column starts 'Derrick then looked.' Do you see that? 12 Α Yes. 1.3 It says, 'Derrick then looked at me and said, "I am 14 the one who blasted that nigger on Fishman's porch." I asked 15 him what he was talking about. Derrick said, "I am the one who 16 killed Jeremy Rankin while he was sitting on Fishman's porch." 17 So, presumably, this would not be a witness that you would put 18 on because it inculpates your client, is that right? Even 19 though there is an inconsistency with the gun? 20 No. I would have called him. 21 Q All right. And --2.2 Α But -- but --23 Yeah, please. Q 24 In this one, and also, particularly, I'd like to say 25 in the one with Montes Williams, where you've got hearsay

statements of Jeremy Sturdevant. Jeremy Sturdevant was the 1 2 defense witness and you had to confront Jeremy with this 3 statement and find out, you know, what he said, what he didn't 4 say, the truth of it. You would just have to confront Jeremy 5 with this statement. 6 Speaking of Mr. Sturdevant, you were able to -- you Q 7 called him as a witness in that second case? 8 I did. 9 And he was cooperative with the defense? Q 10 Yes. 11 All right. He actually refused to make a statement 12 to the State, didn't he? 13 I don't know that. If that's what your records 14 reflect, that's probably the truth. 15 All right. If you could please take a look at 16 Defense Exhibit 5. Do you have that there, sir? 17 I do. 18 Okay. I'd like to start in the second paragraph, Q 19 probably about nine lines down, the right column it says, 20 'Derrick said.' 21 Α Okay. 2.2 'Derrick said, "Yeah, I blasted that punk white 23 motherfucker, Jerry Rankin --24 Wait. Stop. Stop. Α

25

Q

Okay.

A Okay. Go ahead.

2.2

Q Okay. 'Derrick said, "Yeah, I blasted that punk white motherfucker, Jerry Rankin." I said, "You bullshitting me?" Derrick said "I swear I did." Derrick said that Jerry tried to shit him for some dope, and then parentheses, crack.' And then it says, 'He said, "Jerry grabbed some crack from him and ran." Derrick said that he caught up with him later; saw Jerry on the porch at a house on Hood Street. Derrick leaving his girlfriend's house on Palisade Circle Walkway by the pool on Hood Street when he walked by the house where Jerry was at. Derrick said he run up to Jerry and pulled out a .380 handgun and he shot Jerry in the head while he was on the porch.

Derrick said Jerry just dropped and blood ran everywhere. A few days later, Derrick asked me if I wanted to buy the .380 handgun. He said he has it stashed.' Is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Again, fair to say that there's some inconsistencies there, but in all, it really inculpates Mr. McRae, isn't that right?

A It does.

Q Okay. And based upon that, would you have called that witness, had you known about --

A No, but I sure wish I had this statement when I was investigating and interviewing him or talking -- and let me qualify that. I'm not certain I talked to Darius Lockhart.

We're talking about 18 years later, but I'm almost certain that I did. I'll say it like that. Just going back through my notes, I'm almost certain I talked to Darius Lockhart, but I don't have a recollection and sometimes you remember -- you kind of piece things together, but I feel like I talked to him.

Q Okay. All right. If we could take a look at Number 11, Defense Exhibit Number 11, please. Again, with -- let me actually get it in. That last statement in that paragraph, 'When I asked him -- and it's referring to Montes Williams -- who did it, he told me that Derrick McRae had killed him.' Is that right?

A Yes.

1.3

2.2

Q Okay. Now, irrespective of the inconsistencies with some of those statements, they all are consistent in that Mr. McRae sold the gun. Is that right? It's just who that he sold it to that's at issue?

A I don't draw that.

Q Okay. One of the things that you brought up on direct is that you felt that it was necessary for the State to place Mr. McRae at the scene with an eyewitness. Is that right?

A I do.

Q Okay. Now, the State was unable to do that and he was still convicted, isn't that right?

A The State convicted Derrick McRae with the motive and

two admissions. And one admission was to a fellow jail inmate. This case was just a scintilla of evidence against Derrick

McRae, and my opinion, for a jury to follow their oaths, listen to the evidence, and do their duty that you cannot convict based on that scintilla of the evidence, there has to be something more. You don't have circumstantial evidence, like, you don't have a gun. In my mind, as I analyzed this case, particularly the second case, someway you've got to place him at the scene. You've got to place him at the scene, and you've got three people who place him at the scene, but in three very inconsistent statements and they place him at the scene — and when I say at the scene, obviously, Maurice Dumas places him at the scene. The other two people place him at the scene

Q I'm not asking your opinion. Thank you for providing it, but I'm asking you a factual question. Isn't it true that Mr. McRae was convicted by a jury of his peers without an eyewitness placing him at the scene of the crime?

A Unfortunately, yes.

2.2

Q Okay. I'm handing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 3. Do you recognize that?

A My memory's refreshed, I'll say it like this, it's an ex parte motion for funds to employ a private investigator.

Q Okay. And that was something that you filed in this case; is that correct?

```
That's correct.
 1
 2
               MR. LAU: Your Honor, may we approach.
 3
               THE COURT:
                           Sure.
 4
                     (Bench conference was held with both counsel
 5
                    present.)
 6
               THE COURT: You may continue.
 7
     BY MR. HAIGH:
               Now, that's a motion that you filed, is that right?
 8
 9
               It is.
10
               Okay. And do you recall whether that was granted or
11
     not?
12
               It was granted.
1.3
               And that was -- I'm showing you what's been marked as
14
     State's Exhibit 4. Now, that's the order granting your motion,
15
     is that right?
16
               That's correct.
17
               And what date was that issued?
18
               July 9, 1997.
          Α
19
               Okay. So, roughly about ten months or so prior to
20
     that final trial, is that right?
2.1
               That's correct.
2.2
               THE COURT: I'm sorry. I think I might have -- I've
23
       got a motion in limine to redact certain motions. Number 4
24
       was --
25
    BY MR. HAIGH:
```

1 I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 2 Do recognize that? I do. Can I go back though? Would you mark this? 3 4 I'm sorry. And that was a motion filed by you? 5 Yes. Can I read just a second? Yes. 6 And what was the date of filing that motion? Q 7 Α This motion is April 17, 1998. 8 Okay. So, that would have been --Q 9 Ten days before the first trial started. Α 10 Now, you indicated that you never had Mr. Nelson's Q 11 statement prior to the first trial? 12 I didn't. 1.3 So, you filed a motion to redact that statement not 14 even knowing what was in it? 15 Yes, I did. Α 16 Q Okay. 17 Α Can I explain that. 18 You've answered my question. Q 19 THE COURT: Go ahead and explain that. 20 This is just Defense 101 that -- I don't know that 21 Thurman Nelson's going to testify and my recommendation to 2.2 Derrick -- I guessed that he would not testify, but what I'm 23 saying here is -- I'm saying based on information believed --24 he made a statement to law enforcement as to the circumstances. 25 I don't know that he's going to testify, and I don't know that

```
the State or the District Attorney's Office is not going to try
 1
 2
     to get that statement into evidence and keep him off the stand.
 3
     That's the reason I'm saying -- I'm protecting my client that
 4
     if they do that, they are going to have to redact all
 5
     references to Derrick in order to preserve Derrick's right
 6
     under Bruton versus United States on Sixth Amendment to
 7
     confront your witnesses. That's just Defense 101, yes basic,
 8
     basic defense.
               I'm showing you what's been marked as State's
 9
10
     Exhibits 6. Do recognize that?
11
          Α
               Yes.
12
          Q
               And what is that?
13
               This is a subpoena.
          Α
14
               Okay. And who was that subpoena of?
          Q
15
               The subpoena was to Corey Robinson.
          Α
16
               Okay. And who issued it?
          Q
               George E. Crump, III.
17
          Α
18
               Okay. And that's you, right?
          Q
19
               That's me.
          Α
20
               All right. So, it's fair to say that Corey Robinson
21
     was under subpoena by you for --
2.2
          Α
               That's exactly right.
23
               Okay. I'm showing you what's been previously marked
     as State's Exhibit 7. Do recognize that?
24
25
          Α
               Yes.
```

Q What is that?

2.2

A This is a subpoena issued by myself to Darius Lockhart.

Q Okay. So, you're aware of his potential value as a witness prior to the day in court, is that right?

A I'm aware of a potential, that's correct. That's a correct statement.

Q Okay. All right. So, I'm showing you what's been marked as State's Exhibit 8. Do recognize that?

A Yes.

O What is that?

A This is where I subpoenaed Jane Karicka who was a deputy -- who I think was a deputy as opposed to assistant clerk of court, to appear and produce a certified copy of Edward Lewis Tender, and this would have been for the second trial.

Q Okay. Presumably, the goal of the certified copy is so you could cross-examine Mr. Tender or put in a rebuttal witness if he testified falsely with regard to his prior history, is that right?

A You're ahead of me on that. Let me take this time to make a correction. I stated that I got off the court appointed list in 2005. I got off of the State list in 2006 and then it took about two years to filter it out. I do not read -- as well-versed as I was at one time, you know, on rules of

evidence and impeachment, but keep it clean. I think that regardless of what the facts would be, whatever Edward admits to, I think I could introduce what he's been tried and convicted of under certain circumstances, and that's the main reason as opposed to in his face and confront him and get a yes, no, this, that. Just get Jane Karicka in there. That he was convicted of, I want to say, 16 counts of -- 16 misdemeanors, maybe a common-law forgery, something along that line.

Q It's fair to say that you were in a position to challenge his record or how he presented it at trial, isn't that right?

A I was in a position the second trial. The first trial I'm shooting from the hip as best I can.

Q This whole proceeding today is only about the second trial, right?

A No, it's not.

1.3

2.2

Q Well, that's the one where Mr. McRae is convicted, isn't that right?

A I'm going to let Mr. Lau argue, but I would argue different.

Q But needless to say, let me make sure I'm understanding, your testimony is that you were prepared to cross examine Mr. Tender on his criminal history during the second trial, is that right?

1 That's correct. 2 Now, you had two investigators in this case, isn't 3 that right? 4 I did. 5 Okay. And Jack Fay was one of them, is that right? 6 Α Yes. 7 0 Who was the other one? 8 Charlie Johnson. 9 And they were active for -- let me back up. You got 10 the order granting you funds to employ investigators about ten 11 months prior to trial, is that right? 12 That's right. 1.3 So fair to say that they were active during that 14 period? 15 That's not a fair statement. Can I have just a Α No. 16 minute to review my time? 17 Sure. 18 I want to review my time sheet. What I normally did 19 with these two investigators was I would try to conserve time. 20 They would meet me at my office, maybe after lunch or in the 21 morning, and try to do as much as we could at one time. my time sheets, it says on 9-16-97 I investigated with the PI's 2.2 23 and that's an hour and 55 minutes, and then on 12-22, 24 investigation with Jack Fay and Charlie, that's three hours.

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

There's not -- doesn't look like there was a lot of time with

25

these investigators, but generally, when I went to interview 1 2 witnesses, I would take these two investigators with me. 3 So, they didn't do any independent investigation on 4 their own? 5 Α No. 6 They were only there for purposes of having a witness 7 for what you --Yes. And I just think it's wise -- in the last 20 8 9 years, you know, in a murder case to have somebody with you 10 wherever you go. I just think it's just wise. 11 And both of these individuals would be present with 12 you for --1.3 If it said -- like I said, for example, it said back 14 there on 12-22, it said investigation with Jack Fay and 15 Charlie. So both of them would be present. And these are --16 both of these were law enforcement officers on Long Island or 17 Staten Island. They retired, moved down to the Pinehurst area, 18 and are friends. You get two for the price of one. 19 Okay. Now, while we're on that same document, that's 20 the document marked as --21 Defendant's Exhibit 13. Thank you. Defendant's Exhibit 13. If you could 2.2 Q 23 look at the entry that I think you looked at before, September 24 30, 1997?

25

Α

Yes.

- Q That plea discussion with Ken Honeycutt. That's the entry that you're showing there?
 - A That's right.

1.3

2.2

- Q Okay. So, Michael Parker was assigned this case, is that right?
 - A The person who tried the case --
- Q Maybe I can help you out. Let me ask this. From 1996 to approximately late March 1998, Michael Parker was assigned to this case, is that right?
 - A I don't know that.
- Q Do you recall correspondence in this case back and forth between you and the prosecutor's office, in general?
- A Generally, what I did -- I mean, my office was right across the street. I generally didn't write letters unless there was some reason I wanted to document something, you know, like a motion in the courthouse. Michael Parker, as best I recall, was the chief assistant. Certainly, the chief assistant from December of '96 onward until he left the DA's office. I assume I talked to Michael Parker, I don't know. I probably did talk to him at length unless it's in here. The trial attorney with Scott Brewer. I can't say that I corresponded with Mike Parker.
- Q Let me ask you this, do you recall whose signature was on the motions for the State that were filed in this case between '96 and about March '98?

If it's Michael Parker, I wouldn't dispute that. 1 2 So, sitting here today you have no personal 3 recollection of any of Michael Parker's involvement in this 4 case? 5 That's correct. But we're talking about 18 6 years ago, and we tried -- no, I don't. 7 We're talking about 18 years ago with all your 8 testimony, aren't we? 9 That's right. That's the reason I brought this. 10 This is pretty much a summary to where I could refresh my 11 memory on anything, but I don't have an independent 12 recollection of talking to Michael Parker. 1.3 Do you recall Ken Honeycutt being the attorney of 14 record at any time in this case? 15 Α No. 16 Then why meet with Ken Honeycutt to discuss a plea 17 agreement? 18 To get the best deal possible. That's my educated 19 That's my educated guess. quess. 20 Do you recall who in the office was able to negotiate deals, in the prosecutor's office? 21 2.2 You would have had -- Scott Brewer would have authority according to my belief. Michael Parker would have 23 24 had authority, and Ken Honeycutt. I generally didn't go to Ken 25 Honeycutt. I could probably get a better deal, lower down.

would have gone -- I would have talked to Michael Parker.

Scott Brewer --

Q No. I'm sorry. Go ahead,

2.2

A As a general rule -- as a general rule, I would not have gone very first to Ken Honeycutt. I would have gone -- there are only two ways that I would have gone to Ken Honeycutt. One way is that I was across the street and I'm talking to the staff -- I'm talking to Scott Brewer, Michael Parker, and they referred to me, you know -- "Ken is here. Go down the hall. It's something that Ken is going to need to check on." That's one way. The other way I would have gone to Ken Honeycutt -- and this is rare because I'm not going to get as good a deal generally, is that I've gone to one or two of the other people, and I've got as good as I can and I'll try to get something better.

Q Now, in murder cases -- your testimony here today is that in murder cases first assistants, or people other than Ken Honeycutt, had authority to negotiate dispositions?

A That would be my understanding. It might have been that he's given them authority, you know, on this case, this and this range. I don't know what his conversations were with his -- you know, I don't know if he had a cap. It's just like me selling my car, you know, you can go sell my car, but you can't sell it for less than \$15,000 or \$20,000. I don't know what authority he gave them, but generally, with Ken

```
Honeycutt -- I would go to an assistant before I'd go to him.
 1
 2
               Okay. And can you please show in your fee summary
 3
     here where you went to another attorney before him?
 4
               Is there one on there?
 5
               I'm asking you?
               Okay. Just going through this, I'm reviewing a --
 6
 7
     looks like you've got a Dorothea Dix report that I'm reviewing
 8
     September 23, 1997, so I'm probably not doing a whole lot of
 9
     negotiations before then.
10
               MR. LAU: Your Honor, if it's okay with the Court
       while he reviews that, if we take an afternoon recess.
11
12
       would appreciate that opportunity.
1.3
               THE COURT: All right. Let's do that. We'll take a
14
       ten minute break.
15
                    (Court in recess for afternoon break.)
16
               THE COURT: If you want to repeat your last question,
       or Mr. Crump, do you recall the last question.
17
18
               MR. HAIGH: I don't recall having one pending
19
       actually.
20
     BY MR. HAIGH:
21
               Now, sir, if you wouldn't mind looking at Defendant's
2.2
     Exhibit 16. And is it fair to say that on each of those sheets
23
     in the criminal history, it lists initials for an ADA, is that
24
     right?
25
          Α
               It list what now?
```

Initials of the ADA? 1 Q 2 That's correct. 3 Now, are you aware whether it's the ADA that was 0 4 assigned the case or the docket attorney that the clerk lists 5 in terms of initials? 6 I just don't want to speculate on that. 7 Q Okay, so you don't know? 8 I don't know. 9 Additionally, are you aware what happens to those 10 initials if one DA is assigned the case originally and then 11 another one does the PVH a few years later? 12 What's PVH? 1.3 Probation Violation Hearing? Q 14 I just don't know. Α 15 Okay. So, although you speculated earlier as to the 16 initials of Scott Brewer, you're not sure the manner in which 17 they would arrive on this document or what the surrounding 18 circumstances would be of that? 19 No, but as a highly educated guess, these would stand 20 for Scott Brewer, but how it got there, I just don't know what 21 the clerk's procedure is. 2.2 Q All right. Thank you. 23 MR. HAIGH: No further questions. 24 THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I make a correction? 25

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: The question was asked to me before lunch my experience in murder cases, and I said I had ten cases. I tried two capital murder cases. Then you asked another question, kind of a different phrase, how many capital cases I had, and then I had a recollection of one of those ten cases. There was actually nine cases, Derrick's was tried It started as a capital murder case, but didn't go the twice. My recollection now, on that third case, my whole way. educated guess is that the State started off as a capital murder case, but by the time we got to a jury trial, it was proceeding first-degree noncapital and then go on. have a recollection of that case being more than a three or four day trial.

THE COURT: Any further questions about that?

MR. HAIGH: No questions.

THE COURT: Redirect.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. LAU:

Q On that point Mr. Crump, in your experience, you gained familiarity with the hearsay rule?

A Yes. Don't ask me the exceptions.

Q I won't ask you about the exceptions, but the hearsay rules are for when you're trying to introduce a statement for the proof of the matter asserted with that statement, is that

right? 1 2 That's right. 3 Now, with respect to these statements, of course, if 4 they're inconsistent and you don't believe they're true, 5 wouldn't they be introduced to establish that they're false? 6 MR. HAIGH: I'm going to object. It calls for legal 7 conclusion. Okay. I'm going to let him offer his 8 THE COURT: 9 opinion about that. 10 Two things. One is certainly you could question 11 about the inconsistencies, and the second thing is I would have 12 known the rule when I tried it. 1.3 THE COURT: You can't say? 14 THE WITNESS: I can't say now, and can I have a 15 follow-up. 16 THE COURT: Go ahead with your answer. 17 THE WITNESS: On all those people I subpoenaed, such 18 as Corey Robinson, Darius Lockart, the reason that they are 19 subpoenaed is they didn't incriminate things to me when I 20 talked to them, but in case the State is going to try to slip 21 in hearsay and say well, that's not to prove the truth of the 2.2 matter asserting or some way, I wanted to have that if Plan 23 B -- to have them in there. 24 THE COURT: Thank you. 25 BY MR. LAU:

```
So, you would have questioned on the inconsistencies?
 1
          Q
 2
               That's exactly right.
 3
               MR. LAU: If I may approach, Your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: Yes.
 5
     BY MR. LAU:
 6
               Mr. Crump, I'm handing you what's been marked
 7
     Defendant's Exhibit 17. If I may direct your attention to
 8
     Page 75, Line 13. Let me back up -- let me back that -- let me
     begin with Page 70, Line 24 and at Page 70, Line 24, can you
10
     began reading the transcript --
11
               MR. HAIGH: Your Honor --
12
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
               MR. HAIGH: I don't believe that this exhibit has
1.3
14
       been listed in the record in terms of what it actually is or
15
       anything yet so --
16
               THE COURT: All right.
17
               MR. LAU: I apologize, Your Honor.
18
     BY MR. LAU:
19
               Mr. Crump, I would purport to you that this is the
20
     testimony of Thurman Nelson during the second trial in this
21
     case?
2.2
               It appears to be so.
23
               And you were the attorney of record during this
24
     trial, is that correct?
25
          Α
               I was.
```

- Q And do you recall Mr. Nelson testifying?
- A I recall him testifying, and then I reread the transcript in preparation for today, so my memory's been refreshed.
 - Q Thank you. I apologize for any confusion. If I may direct your attention to Page 70, Line 24?
 - A Okay.

2.2

- Q And if you wouldn't mind reading from Page 70, Line 24 to Page 75. I'm sorry, Page 71, Line 15.
- "Mr. Nelson, would you be kind enough to hand me that statement, thank you. Mr. Nelson, you been charged with first-degree murder. Answer: Yes. Question: In this same case? Answer: Yes. Question: Did you see when Jerry Rankin was shot and killed? Answer: No, sir. Question: Were you present when Jerry Rankin was shot and killed? Answer: No, sir. Question: Did you encourage any person to shoot or kill Jerry Rankin? Answer: No, sir.
- Q Thank you. You can stop there. Now, Defendant's Exhibit 8, which was read by the State into the record, if you could find Defendant's Exhibit 8. If I could direct your attention to the bottom of Page 3, beginning at where it says 'Derrick and Thurman,' approximately seven lines up from the bottom?
- MR. LAU: If I may approach, I can point out to you,

```
1
      Mr. Crump.
 2
               THE COURT: All right.
 3
     BY MR. LAU:
 4
               The bottom of Page 3. Would you mind reading that to
 5
     the last line on page 3?
 6
               'derrick and Thurman run down the hill that is in
 7
     front of the house and started running toward me, and they
 8
     still had the guns in their hands. I ran to the woods and hid
 9
     because I was scared they were going to shoot me.'
10
               You can stop there if you don't mind. So,
          Q
11
     Mr. Nelson, during his testimony, testified that he was not
12
     involved in this crime whatsoever, is that right?
1.3
               That's right.
          Α
14
               While he was a witness for the State?
          Q
15
               That's right.
          Α
16
               And you didn't have the statement?
          Q
17
          Α
               I had this statement.
18
               I'm sorry. Mr. Dumas' statement?
          Q
19
               No, I didn't. No, I didn't.
          Α
20
               Let me direct your attention to the same transcript,
21
     Page 75, Line 13. And if you can begin reading at line 13, and
2.2
     read through line 25?
23
               Question: Between 10:30 and 11:00 on October 13,
24
     1995, the same night that you saw Jerry Rankin spinning tires?
25
     Answer: Uh huh. Question: You went to the house where
```

Derrick McRae was staying? Answer: Uh huh. Question: 1 2 you went in with Antoine Rush? Answer: Uh huh. Question: Did you see Derrick McRae? Answer: Uh huh. Question: 3 What 4 was he doing? Answer: He was asleep. So, the Sate witness testified that he was asleep 5 6 between 10:30 and 11 p.m.? 7 That's correct. Α Now, can I direct your attention to Defendant's 8 9 Exhibit 6, which is the statement of Larry Parker. And if I 10 can direct you -- and it might be more helpful if I point it 11 out to you? 12 MR. LAU: Your Honor, I'm going to point to where it 13 begins, 'After they left.' 14 THE COURT: All right. BY MR. LAU: 15 16 If you could just read this sentence here? 17 'after they left, Jerry asked me what time it was, 18 and I told him it was 10:34 p.m.' 19 What was Mr. McRae doing according to the State's 20 witness at 10:34 p.m.? 21 He was sleeping. Α 2.2 Q Thank you. 23 Α He was sleeping between 10:30 and 11. 24 Thank you. Now, if I could direct your attention to 25 Defendant's Exhibit 7, which is the statement of Serena Parker,

and if you wouldn't mind just reading the first sentence in that statement beginning with on 'October 14th.'

A 'on October 14, 1995, at about 10:50 p.m, I was in my apartment located at 912 Palisade Circle in Rockingham.

About at this time, I heard some people talking outside my bedroom window. The lights were off in my apartment, and I didn't have a curtain up to the window. So, when I looked out the window to see who it was, I saw Derrick McRae, Thurman Nelson, Jeremy Sturdevant, Johnny McRae, Julio Serrano talking.'

- Q You can stop there. At 10:50 p.m, according to the State's witness, what was Derrick McRae doing?
 - A Between 10:30 and 11 he was sleeping.
- Q Thank you. Now, the State asked you whether it was entirely consistent in each statement that Derrick McRae sold the gun. Do you recall that question?
 - A Generally, yes.

1.3

2.2

- Q If you don't mind, let me direct you to Defendant's Exhibit 5, which is the statement of Darius Lockhart. If you don't mind, if I can call your attention to the second page of the statement, the second sentence up which begins 'He said,' just above the signature line, the second to last statement to beginning with 'He said.'
- A 'He said he had it stashed.'
 - Q So, he had the gun stashed?

```
1
               That's what that says.
               So, the statements the State has aren't consistent
 2
 3
     with respect to whether or not Mr. McRae sold the gun, are
 4
     they?
 5
               No.
 6
               Mr. Crump, did you have the complete investigative
 7
     file of the Rockingham Police Department when you --
 8
          Α
               No.
 9
               --were defending Mr. McRae in this case?
          Q
10
          Α
               No.
               You did not?
11
          Q
12
          Α
               No.
1.3
               And the only materials you had were what was provided
          Q
14
     to you --
15
               In discovery.
          Α
16
               And that was that general felony discovery form,
          Q
17
     correct?
18
               That's right.
          Α
19
               MR. LAU: May I approach.
20
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
     BY MR. LAU:
2.2
               Mr. Crump, I've handed you what's been marked
23
     Defendant's Exhibit 18, which is the testimony of Jeremy
24
     Sturdevant at Mr. McRae's second trial. If you would, could
25
     you begin on Page 214, Line three.
```

1 Α Okay. 2 Can you read from Line three on Page 214 to Line 24? 3 'Question: Now, you haven't talked to one single law 4 enforcement officer about this so-called cookout, have you? 5 Answer: Yes. Question: Where? Answer: Both of them. 6 Question: When? Answer: That day it happened. Question: 7 The day the cookout happened? Answer: No, the day they picked 8 Derrick McRae up. They came and picked me up the next day, harassing me. My mama was with me. I go get my mama, she was 10 with me when they was harassing me. Question: You say you 11 told both these officers? Answer: I told them the same thing. 12 Question: About the cookout? Answer: Yes. Question: 13 didn't write it down for you? Answer: No. I wasn't paying 14 attention. I was telling them. I don't know if they were 15 writing it down or not. Question: You weren't given anything 16 to sign like the other people that testified, were you?" 17 You can stop there. So, Mr. Sturdevant didn't refuse 18 to talk to law enforcement? 19 MR. HAIGH: Objection, Your Honor, we have no idea 20 what really happened. We just have the testimony of an 2.1 individual. Who's to say whether it's truthful or not? 2.2 I'm going to object. 23 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain it as to what his

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

opinion is as to the truthfulness.

MR. LAU:

24

25

That's fine. I have no further questions.

```
1
               THE COURT: Any further questions?
                          No, Your Honor.
 2
               MR. HAIGH:
 3
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you, Mr. Crump. You may step down.
 4
               MR. LAU: At this time, we would move to have
 5
       Defendant's Exhibits 17 and 18 admitted, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: All right. They can be admitted.
 7
                    (Defendant's Exhibits 17 and 18 were admitted.)
 8
               THE WITNESS: Your Honor, am I free to leave?
 9
               THE COURT: Any objection.
10
               MR. LAU:
                        I would just ask that you be on phone
11
       standby should we need your testimony.
12
               THE COURT: Yes, sir. You're free to leave the
1.3
       courthouse.
14
               MR. LAU: Can we have five minutes.
15
               THE COURT: We just had 15 minutes.
16
               MR. LAU: We've got the witnesses sequestered.
17
               THE COURT: All right. We will be patient.
18
                        I apologize, Your Honor, but we would ask
               MR. LAU:
19
       Mr. Crump to come up one more time for clarifying question.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. All right.
21
               MR. LAU: And then we're ready to proceed on our next
2.2
       witness.
23
               THE COURT: All right.
24
     BY MR. LAU:
25
               Mr. Crump, just as clarification with respect to one
                    PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM
                    OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
```

1	final ques	stion, you have with you today the State's synopsis of			
2	this investigation?				
3	A That's correct.				
4	Q Did you have that prior to the trial in this case				
5	A No, I did not.				
6	Q And that was furnished to you by Mr. McRae's post				
7	conviction counsel, is that				
8	A That's correct. Some time in 2010 or thereabout.				
9	Q Thank you.				
10		MR. LAU: I have no further questions.			
11		THE COURT: Any questions from the State?			
12		MR. HAIGH: No, Your Honor.			
13		MR. LAU: The defense calls Edward Tender, Your			
14	Honor.				
15	THE COURT: All right.				
16		The witness, Edward Tender, was sworn and			
17	testified as follows to the examination of				
18	counsel.				
19		DIRECT EXAMINATION			
20	BY MR. LA	J:			
21	Q	Good afternoon, Mr. Tender. Would you state your			
22	full name	for the record.			
23	А	Edward Lewis Tender.			
24	Q	And Mr. Tender, how old are you?			
25	А	Sixty-two.			
		PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM			

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

And Mr. Tender, you're an alcoholic, is that correct? 1 Q 2 Α Recovering alcoholic. 3 And how long have you been sober? Q 4 This January will be -- January 3rd will be 24 5 months. 6 Twenty-four months on January 3rd? 7 Α Yes, 24 months. 8 Now, have you taken the steps, over the course of 9 those 24 months, to maintain your sobriety? 10 Yes. I go to my meetings. 11 And what is it that you do with respect to your 12 recovery? 1.3 I go to AA meetings. I work in the community and the 14 church, and I mentor two little boys. 15 And how frequently do you attend AA meetings? 0 16 At least twice a week. 17 At least twice a week? 18 Yeah, twice. When I first started I was going -- I Α 19 made about a meeting every night. 20 Now, are you a religious person, Mr. Tender? 21 Α Yes, I am. 2.2 Q Can you describe your participation in the church. Are you a member of a church? 23 24 Yes. Α 25 Q And what church is that?

New Bethel AME Zion in Dobbin Heights. 1 Α 2 And do you have a role within that church? 3 I'm on the trustee board and on the choir. 4 And what is your role as a trustee? What are you 5 responsible for? 6 I'm responsible for all the property of the church 7 including the building, the van, the building, the parsonage, 8 and all of the real property that new Bethel owns. 9 Now, you understand you're under oath today? 10 Yes, I do. Α 11 And if you may, can we talk about your prior 12 involvement in this case? 1.3 Yes, as far as I can remember. 14 Do you remember being involved in this case beginning 15 sometime in March 1996? 16 I can vaguely, yeah. 17 You can vaguely remember. What can you remember? 18 I remember I had to go to court a couple of times. think it was two times altogether. It's been about 20 years. 19 20 I'm trying to think back now. 21 Now, in March 2013, where you sober? 2.2 Yes. I'm trying to count back now. This January, 23 like I said, will be two years. Yes. 24 Before discussing March, you previously spoke with 25 counsel for Mr. McRae in this case, is that right? Have you

```
been spoken with by Mr. McRae's counsel, myself?
 1
 2
               Yeah, I spoke with plenty of people.
 3
               Now, do you remember giving a statement in this case
 4
     sometime in March 1996?
 5
               I remember talking. I don't remember exactly what
 6
     the statement was.
 7
               MR. LAU: May I approach.
 8
               THE COURT: Yes.
     BY MR. LAU:
 9
10
               Mr. Tender, I handed you Defendant's Exhibit 19. Can
11
     you identify what this exhibit is?
12
               It's a statement. I see my name at the top. I don't
13
     have my glasses. I lost my glasses. That's my signature at
     the end.
14
15
               Is that your signature at the end?
          0
16
               Yes, sir. A statement at the top, but it's not my
17
     writing.
18
               This isn't your handwriting?
19
               No. That's not my handwriting. I see my name up
20
     there. I can hold it off and see my name and that's definitely
21
     my signature at the end, but I can't see. Like I said, I lost
22
    my glasses.
23
               Now, in March 1996, were you incarcerated at that
24
     time?
25
          Α
               196?
```

At the Richmond County jail? 1 Q 2 Α I was incarcerated in '96, yes. 3 In March of '96, do you recall? 0 4 I can't recall. It's been over 20 some years ago. 5 My math --6 Do you recall being incarcerated with Derrick McRae? 7 I recall being (inaudible) with Derrick McRae, 8 yeah. It was a lot of other people, they was (inaudible). 9 Did you speak with Mr. McRae while he was in --10 I remember speaking with him. We was in the 11 same cell. I can't remember what block. 12 The same cell or the same cell block? 1.3 We was in the same cell block, you know, that big old 14 place where everybody is crammed in. Like I said, it's vague. 15 Mr. Tender, because you don't have your glasses, I'll 16 read the statement for you, and then I have a couple of 17 questions for you. 'On this day, 26th day of March, 1996, I 18 Edward Lewis Tender, request to speak with Detective JC Britten 19 and Sergeant Voorhees without my lawyer present.' Do you recall 20 ever meeting with law enforcement without your lawyer present? Not right, you know, not word for word -- -21 2.2 'About two weeks ago -- continuing -- Derrick McRae, 23 who's in jail for murder, came to me and told me he wanted to 24 talk to me. Derrick McRae told me that he walked up on a white

boy, Jerry Rankin, while he was on a porch sleeping. Derrick

25

McRae said when he walked up on the porch, he put a .380 1 2 handgun to Jerry Rankin's head and shot him. Derrick McRae 3 said that he then took the .380 handgun and hid it in some 4 bushes near the house where he shot Jerry Rankin. Derrick 5 McRae said that about two days later him and two other boys, 6 but I can't remember their names, went back and got the .380 7 handgun and took it and hid it in Chapel Town near Derrick McRae's house. Derrick McRae said that the reason he shot 8 9 Jerry Rankin was because he was a white boy. Derrick McRae 10 also said that all white people need to die. Yesterday on 11 3-35-1996 -- which I believe should be 25 -- Derrick McRae came 12 to me and said that he was going to kill some of the police. 13 Derrick McRae said he was going to start with Phil Sweat, 14 Detective Britten, Caption McQuay, and he was going to work his 15 way down.' Do you recall this statement? 16 Not right off hand. Like I said, that was twenty 17 something years ago. I've been through a lot and I can't 18 remember. 19 Do you recall Derrick McRae telling these things to 20 you? 21 Like I said, you know, it's been twenty something 2.2 years so, I can't remember. My mind has been through a lot. 23 Mr. Tender, I don't -- we talked about this before,

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

24

25

is that correct?

Yeah.

Α

1 Q And was your mind substantially better then? 2 Yes, it was. 3 Mr. Tender, I'm handing you what's been marked 4 Defendant's Exhibit 20. Can you identify Defendant's Exhibit 5 20? 6 I tried to -- like I said, I don't have my -- I see 7 my signature over here. 8 Is that your signature? 9 Yes, it is. It doesn't look like my handwriting 10 because I can even type. 11 Now, on March 2013, you previously testified that you 12 were sober during that time, is that correct? 13 Yes, I did. 14 So, during this time in March 2013, you would have 15 been being honest, is that correct? 16 Yeah. 17 You would have honestly been speaking about what it 18 was you remembered from this case? 19 Yeah, probably was. I had talked to so many people Α 20 on this case. 21 And you've told many of those people -- well, first 2.2 let's -- if you don't mind, can you read your affidavit, 23 Mr. Tender? 24 MR. HAIGH: I object to hearsay, Your Honor. 25 Like I said, my eyes are bad. I can't see this. Α

```
THE COURT: I'm not going to require that you read
 1
 2
       it.
 3
               THE WITNESS: I lost my glasses, Your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT:
                           That's all right.
               THE WITNESS: And the VA providing them. I've got a
 5
 6
     doctor's appointment in the morning.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Thank you.
 8
     BY MR. LAU:
               Mr. Tender, Paragraph 11, you said you were being
 9
10
              It says, 'I provided false statements to detectives
11
     and testified falsely against Derrick McRae to improve my
12
     outcomes of my cases'
1.3
               MR. HAIGH: Objection. Hearsay, Your Honor.
                                                              This is
14
       improper impeachment.
15
               THE COURT: All right. I'm going to sustain that.
16
               MR. LAU: Your Honor, at this point in time, if
17
       Mr. Tender is saying that he --
18
     BY MR. LAU:
19
               Mr. Tender, can you examine the contents of this
20
     affidavit?
21
               I told you my eyes -- I don't have my glasses.
     can't see. Everything is blurry. I lost my glasses.
2.2
23
               If I read this to you, would that refresh your
24
     recollection of your statement dated March 21, 2013?
25
          Α
               I don't think it would.
```

1	Q That wouldn't refresh your recollection?			
2	Mr. Tender, is it possible for you to get another pair of			
3	glasses and come back and testify for this Court at a time when			
4	you do have your glasses?			
5	A Like I said like I said, it's up to the VA, you			
6	know. I'm going tomorrow to see about getting some more. They			
7	might get them in the next few days a day or two, it's			
8	possible.			
9	Q So, tomorrow's appointment is to see if you can			
10	obtain your glasses?			
11	A Yeah, obtain glasses and for the PTSD evaluation and			
12	medical evaluation. It will be after 12:30.			
13	Q Did Derrick ever tell you, Mr. Tender, that he was			
14	involved in the death of Jerry Rankin?			
15	A I can't remember, sir.			
16	Q Have you testified in other murder trials,			
17	Mr. Tender?			
18	A Not that my recollection like I said, it's been			
19	over 20 some years, I can't remember.			
20	Q Not in your recollection? Is testifying a memorable			
21	thing to you, Mr. Tender?			
22	A It used to be when I was younger. I'm 62 years old			
23	now, you know, battling with this recovery. It's a lot of			
24	other stuff.			
25	Q So, your testimony is you don't remember whether			

Derrick McRae told you?

1.3

2.2

A I don't.

MR. LAU: Your Honor, at this point in time, I would have no further questions, but I would ask to recall

Mr. Tender tomorrow afternoon after his appointment in hopes that he gets glasses, and I would have the opportunity to properly refresh the witness with his previous statement.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: I should have them tomorrow.

THE COURT: I can't vouch for whether you're going to get your glasses or not by tomorrow.

I'm not going to delay the hearing of this matter beyond the next day or two, beyond the time that it otherwise would take us to conclude the hearing. I would agree, if you wish to do so, that you could call him out of order even after the State has presented evidence. I'll leave it open to allow you to do that, but I'm not going to leave it open beyond the normal course of this hearing.

MR. LAU: I understand, Your honor.

THE COURT: For him to get a pair of glasses. He's answered some questions based on his recollection even without having been refreshed. I'll certainly consider what he's already testified to, and I'm going to give the State's counsel an opportunity to go ahead and cross examine him at this point as to any of the matters that he's already

testified about, if you wish to do so, because I don't know 1 2 whether he's going to be back here or not. You're not 3 required to do so, I'm just telling you this is your 4 opportunity if you wish to do so. 5 CROSS EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. HAIGH: 7 Now, Mr. Tender, you testified in two different 8 trials regarding Derrick McRae, right? 9 Yes, sir. If I can remember correctly. 10 Okay. And you were under oath at those times, right? 11 Α Yes. 12 And you testified truthfully at the first hearing, 1.3 didn't you? 14 Yes, sir, to the best of my knowledge. I can't 15 remember. 16 All right. And you testified truthfully at the second trial, didn't you? 17 18 Best that I can remember. 19 Q All right. Thank you. 20 Any further questions? THE COURT: 21 MR. HAIGH: No. 2.2 THE COURT: Anything further? 23 MR. LAU: We would ask to reserve. 24 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step down. 25 Give me just one second. PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

```
1
               MR. LAU: At this time, the defense would call Robert
 2
       Voorhees.
 3
               THE COURT: All right.
 4
                    The witness, Robert Voorhees, was sworn and
 5
                    testified as follows to the Examination of
 6
                    counsel.
 7
               MR. LAU: Your Honor, at this time, before we start
 8
       with Mr. Voorhees, I would move to admit Defendant's Exhibit
       19 and 20.
 9
10
               MR. HAIGH: Your Honor --
               THE COURT:
11
                          Yes.
12
               MR. HAIGH: I object to Exhibit Number 20 in that
1.3
       it's hearsay. I think there's clear law that's particular,
14
       even in MARs, about hearsay affidavits not being viable
15
       evidence. I object to Number 20.
16
               THE COURT: What do you say about Number 20?
17
               MR. LAU: We will, at the appropriate time, move to
18
       introduce it, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: All right. I'm going to deny its
20
       admission at this point. I will admit Number 19.
21
               MR. LAU: Thank you.
2.2
                    (Defense Exhibit Number 19 was admitted.)
23
     BY MR. LAU:
24
               Mr. Voorhees, Good afternoon?
25
          Α
               Good afternoon.
                    PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM
                    OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
```

1	Q	Would you state your full name?		
2	А	Robert Joseph Voorhees.		
3	Q	Mr. Voorhees, how are you currently employed?		
4	А	I'm employed with HO Waltman Trucking Company in		
5	Wisconsin	•		
6	Q	And how were you previously employed?		
7	А	The City of Rockingham as a law enforcement officer.		
8	Q	And what was your position upon retiring from the		
9	City of Rockingham or when you left the City of Rockingham?			
10	А	I was the chief of police.		
11	Q	Now, how long were you employed by the Rockingham		
12	Police Department?			
13	А	Roughly 22 years.		
14	Q	And in 1996, you would have been employed with the		
15	Rockingham Police Department?			
16	A	That's correct.		
17	Q	And do you recall what your position was in 1996?		
18	A	I was in the investigation division and, to the best		
19	of my memory, I held several different ranks during that			
20	timeframe. I think I was a Detective Sergeant.			
21	Q	And with respect to in October of 1996, how were		
22	you employed in October of 1996? If you can recall.			
23	A	I was employed in the detective division, criminal		
24	investigations with the City of Rockingham Police Department.			
25	Q	And can you describe, as part of your employment,		

what training you had received at that time for criminal investigations?

2.2

A At that time, I had received basic law enforcement training with Randolph Community College, many in-service training things. I would have to go back and look at a transcript to tell you exactly what. I did not prepare for that or bring that with me today, but I remember attending several classes such as basic criminal investigation, interrogation. At some point, I enrolled in Richmond Community College and was in their associates program for criminal justice. In '96, I believe I was actively enrolled at that time in October '96. Seems like I finished that somewhere in '98, in that time frame. It's almost 20 years ago. It's hard to remember the exact dates.

Q With respect to your training, do you remember anything specifically about how you were trained to document investigations?

A Yes. During the many criminal investigation courses I took and within departmental policy and procedures and how I was trained internally, I have a clear recollection of the basics of how we would document things.

Q And what were those basics? What would you do to document the investigations that you conducted?

A Well, different parts of the investigation would require different documentation. If you're talking about a

piece of evidence, there was an evidence control form, physical evidence, whether it be a handwritten statement from someone — depending on whether the officer wrote it or the individual witness or suspect wrote it — all those things would be documented differently.

Q And how about your investigative activities when you went to a neighborhood? When you knocked on a door? When you made contact with someone? What would you do to document those?

A Those would be in officer notes.

2.2

Q And would those officer notes ever incorporate into a supplemental investigation report or any report with respect to documenting, sort of, what was there in the officer's notes or the detective's notes?

A During that time, I knew at one point, officer's notes weren't discoverable and then the rules changed for court procedures and they became discoverable. So, you know, at different times either we'd put them all in the discovery packet and hand them over to the district attorney or we would retain them until such time we were asked for them or had to go to court to use them to testify.

Q So, if an officer spoke with an individual and made a note of it, how would other officers be aware that that individual had already spoken with an officer because you did -- how would the next officer know that that individual had

been spoken to?

2.1

2.2

A Within our department, we only had three investigators at any given time. Part of our annual or routine in the morning would be, you know, we'd catch each other up with the status of where things were, especially with the more serious pending cases, and we would let them know what, you know, relevant facts or what new things were appearing in the case or new statements, new evidence, if we got lab reports back, if we talked to a new witness, whatever the case may be.

If a witness was talked to, it would be standard procedure for it to be documented and either we'd ask the witness to handwrite his own statement or we would write it ourselves and ask him to sign it or document that it was a field interview or whatever. Like I said, it's several different levels of evidence it may be.

Q Were there any master files with respect to cases that the material would ultimately end up in?

A There is a master file for every case that the Rockingham Police Department generated at the time, and then there was a master investigation file.

- Q And what went into the master investigation file?
- A All the work product of the investigation.
- Q Everything?
- A Yes.
- 25 Q So, officer notes would eventually make it into that

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Yes.

When you respond to a crime scene, just generally, can you tell me what it is that you do initially at the scene?

What type of crime scene?

A homicide. When you respond to a homicide can you tell me what typically was your actions?

Well if -- as the investigating officer or the assigned detective or detective on call at the time, which as I recall at that time I was, you would go to the crime scene, speak to the responding officers. You would document what you found, the weather, what it was like, your physical observations, what you saw yourself. At that point, you have to make a determination whether you are able to process the crime scene or you would request assistance from an outside agency to come assist you in processing the crime scene, which in this case, I believe that's what occurred.

Now, I just want to clarify, you said there's a Q master case file for every case?

Α Yes, sir.

Is that right? And then, I think you said, there is a master investigator case file for every case. Are there two files?

For every crime that gets reported to the Rockingham Police Department, at that time -- I can't testify to what

currently happens today. But at that time, a master incident file was created, an incident file. If an investigation was opened up into the crime, an investigation file was opened up subsequently.

Q So, can you tell me what the difference between the two -- what would be in the master incident file versus what would be in the master investigative file?

A In the incident file, it would just be the original officer's incident report and his supplement reports that were filed by the officers and a subsequent arrest report, if an arrest was made, and any preliminary investigation that was done prior to the investigation file being opened.

Q What warranted a supplemental report?

A If something was changed or new evidence was brought to the original officer's attention that he didn't add to the original report that was pertinent to the original crime that was wrote on the O2.

- Q And all these were the practices of the Rockingham Police Department in October of 1996?
 - A Yes.

1.3

2.2

- Q Do you recall the investigation of Jerry Rankin's death?
- A I recall the incident, yes.
- Q What do you recall from the investigation?
- 25 A I was not the only investigating officer in the case.

I remember being called out that night to the crime scene. I remember requesting the assistance of the crime scene investigator from the Richmond County Sheriff's Department to come out and process the scene. I remember subsequent following up the investigation. I remember there being a time period between the time of the incident and the actual arrest in the case. There was -- I would consider it to be a significant -- in other words, it wasn't a couple weeks, it seems like it was months at least, I don't know the exact time period.

I remember the name of the individuals that were charged. I remember there being two trials, and much more specifics then that is all. I haven't reviewed the case. I haven't looked at the case. I haven't worked for the police department in over two years. I haven't actually seen the case file itself in probably, well, over five to seven years. So, anything that I would testify to without refreshing my memory or looking at the file would all be speculation.

- Q Do you still have any notes personally from this case?
 - A No, I do not.
 - Q So, in your possession or --
- 23 A No, I do not.

1.3

2.2

Q Was there ever a doubt that this was a homicide? Was there ever a period when it was in question whether or not a

homicide occurred or whether or not it was a suicide or any 1 2 other sort of cause of death? 3 I don't remember if I attended the autopsy or 4 somebody else attended the autopsy. I do remember that the 5 medical examiner ruled it a homicide, fairly. There was not 6 much question after his autopsy. 7 MR. LAU: If I may approach, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 BY MR. LAU: 10 Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit Number 21. Can you identify this exhibit? 11 12 If you'll give me just a moment to review it. 1.3 Sure. Take your time. 14 It looks to be partial what I would recognize as an 15 autopsy report from the medical examiner's office. I remember 16 them being a lot more than just four one-sided pages. 17 Let me hand you what I've marked as Defendant's 18 Exhibit 22 and that may help you out. Can you identify Defendant's Dxhibit 22, Mr. Voorhees? Do you recognize what 19 20 this document is? 21 Yes. It appears to be the medical examiner's 2.2 examination report and toxicology report of the autopsy of 23 Mr. Jerry Rankin. 24 And do these documents help refresh your recollection 25 on when it was that the autopsy took place and the medical

examiner reviewed the body? 1 2 Α Yes. 3 On Defendant's Exhibit 21, can you see there at the 4 bottom that date of the medical examiner's review? 5 Twenty-one on the bottom. 6 Of the first page. 7 I can make out the 10 and 14 are the first two Α 8 numbers. The last two I'm going to assume say 95, but the 9 handwriting is poor. 10 And does this form indicate a manner of death? 11 It says probable cause of death gunshot wound to the Α 12 head. 1.3 And below that, do you see where it says manner of 14 death? Homicide. 15 Α 16 So, at the time the medical examiner viewed the body, 17 it was apparent from that time that it was a homicide? 18 Yes. Α 19 Now, as the sergeant, the investigative sergeant, 20 what were your responsibilities with respect to the other 21 investigators on staff? 2.2 I want to make it clear that I'm not testifying to 23 exactly what my rank was at the time. 24 Q Okay. 25 I was in the investigation division. I'm not Α

absolutely sure when I was promoted to Detective Sergeant. 1 2 I understand. 3 But I was in the investigative division. I did hold 4 the rank of investigator, and I was one of the investigators on 5 this case. 6 When you were the investigative sergeant, what was 7 your responsibility with respect to the roles and things? 8 Well, in that time, there was two other individuals 9 in the police department, a Captain and a Detective Lieutenant, 10 that would have had operational control over me, you know, over 11 the investigation department that we would report to. As a 12 Sergeant, I was more or less the first line supervisor, the 13 on-site supervisor, although that night, I was the only one 14 there. 15 MR. LAU: May I approach. 16 THE COURT: Sure. 17 BY MR. LAU: 18 I'm handing you what's been marked Defendant's 19 Exhibit 23. Do you recognize what Defendant's Exhibit 23 is? 20 It is a one time used form at the police department 21 for reporting felonies to the District Attorney's Office. Now, on the upper left-hand corner, Defendant's 2.2 Exhibit 23, it is the investigative officer and it says RJ 23 24 Voorhees, is that you? 25 Α Yes.

- 1 Q And what was your rank at the time?
 - A At the time this report was filled out, it says I was Detective Sergeant.
 - Q Now, in preparing this report, what would you do to prepare this report?
 - A I would sit down and fill it out based on the best of my knowledge and the knowledge contained in the investigative report to give a summary to the district attorney of what information we had.
 - Q Would you review the case file?
 - A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q And would you review the statements and the notes and whatever was there in the case file?
- 14 A Yes.
- Q Why was that important?
 - A Well, filling out this report would be our first communication with the district attorney to allow them to know what was contained in the case file until such time we did discovery, and it would give them an idea of what was in possession of the police department and if they needed any further review for indictment or whatever, they could ask for it immediately before they received the entire packet.
 - Q So that which was listed here was the materials that were in the case file?
 - A Correct.

1	Q	And the purpose of this was to communicate what those		
2	materials	were to the district attorney?		
3	А	Correct.		
4	Q	On that report that you have in front of you, does		
5	that indic	cate a defendant?		
6	А	Yes. It indicates two defendants.		
7	Q	And who are the defendants in the case?		
8	А	Thurmond Nelson and Derrick McRae.		
9	Q	Now, on the top of that form, is there a primary		
10	defendant	that that felony report is in reference to?		
11	А	Yes. One had been filled out for everyone that was		
12	charged.			
13	Q	Okay. Who is the primary defendant with respect to		
14	the form	that I just handed you?		
15	А	In respect to the form it was Thurmond Nelson.		
16	Q	Thank you. Now, if you don't mind, turning the		
17	felony rep	port that you have in your hand to Page 4 where it		
18	lists witnesses?			
19	A	Yes, sir.		
20	Q	Now, that's where you begin listing out what evidence		
21	specifical	lly that the police department has in its file, is		
22	that accur			
23	А	Yes, at that time. It's important to note this was		
24	A Yes, at that time. It's important to note this was done at time of the arrest and just because the arrest occurred			
25	the investigation didn't stop.			

1	Q	The investigation didn't stop?			
2	А	No.			
3	Q	At the time of the arrest. Now, those investigative			
4	records,	those also would be in the master file, would they			
5	not?				
6	А	Yes.			
7	Q	Mr. Voorhees, I'm going to hand you another felony			
8	report, this being marked Defendant's Exhibit 24. Do you				
9	recognize	this report?			
10	А	Yes.			
11	Q	And again, who is responsible for creating this			
12	report?				
13	А	Appears to be my handwriting.			
14	Q	And who was the primary defendant with respect to			
15	this report?				
16	А	Derrick McRae.			
17	Q	And again, this report would summarize the evidence			
18	for the District Attorney's Office?				
19	А	Correct.			
20	Q	Do you recall prior communication, Mr. Voorhees,			
21	where you indicated that the Rockingham Police Department no				
22	longer ha	d a master case file on this case?			
23	А	No, I don't.			
24	Q	Do the District Attorney's Office, post conviction			
25	lawyers,	or anyone else associated with this case?			
		PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM			

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

A I don't have a clear memory of it. I do remember someone called and I can't remember if it was the District Attorney's Office or someone else called and asked if we had the file and we maybe looked for it. During that time, we had renovated the police department. We actually moved our offices twice during the renovation and many things were reshuffled, stored, and put in storage. This case was closed. At the time, we didn't know of any pending court appeals or whatever and we did not — the day I was asked, the file was not on premises at the Rockingham Police Department, physically in the building.

1.3

2.2

Q Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 25. Do you recognize what Defendant's Exhibit 25 is?

A It appears to be a file containing some of the original work product from the case against Thurmond Nelson and Derrick McRae.

Q Now, on the spine of that, would that binder -- would that indicate that that's the RPD's file for this matter?

A That is part of the filing system, yes, sir. It indicates the type of crime and the original OCA number, but just a cursory look at it, it looks to be two files that were merged together and one of them is just not complete. It's missing a lot of the information that's indexed in it.

Q Which file is missing a lot of information?

Well, you handed this to me as one file. have to say if you're handing this to me --Well, what do you think does not belong in the file? 0 There is nothing in here that I would say doesn't If it's work product, everything belongs in there. But what I'm saying is there is several things in here that are indexed that are just completely not there. By indexing that they are, what are you referring to? I'm saying that if I created this file, and it certainly doesn't look like my work product, anything that was indexed -- the crime scene, evidence statement, witness statements, suspect info, autopsy report, report synopsis -all those are tabbed and indexed, but yet when you turn to the tab there is nothing there. So, your belief is something should be behind each of those tabs? Yes. Mr. Voorhees, I'm handing you what's been marked Q Defendant's Exhibit 26, and I'm going to ask you to take some time and compare what's in Defendant's Exhibit 26 to what's in Defendant's Exhibit 25 and ask you if Defendant's Exhibit 26 is a true copy of the material in Defendant's Exhibit 25 prior to any post conviction matters which I understand may be --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

me to do something that I can't do in five minutes.

Okay. You're ready for this? I mean, you're asking

```
I understand, but it's important?
 1
          Q
 2
               Well, indulge me and I'll be glad to do it.
 3
               THE COURT: We'll indulge you.
 4
               THE WITNESS: He's asking me to do something
 5
     that's --
 6
               MR. LAU:
                         Thank you.
 7
                    (Witness reviews Exhibits 25 and 26.)
 8
               THE COURT: Mr. Voorhees, how far along are you?
 9
       I'm not rushing you. I'm just trying to get an idea of where
10
       our time is.
11
               THE WITNESS: At this point, I'd be willing to say
12
     that they are a fair representation of each other.
1.3
     not exact by any means. One contains some stuff from trial
14
     that obviously couldn't be in the investigation report.
15
     things are dated after my tenure with the police department.
16
     can't testify as to how they got in there or why it's missing
17
     from one and not the other. To say it's a fair representation
18
     of each other, I would say, yeah.
19
               THE COURT: Does that satisfy you?
20
                        That would satisfy me. I don't know if it
               MR. LAU:
21
       satisfies Mr. Haigh.
2.2
               MR. LAU: If I may just ask the witness.
23
               THE COURT: Sure.
24
     BY MR. LAU:
25
               With respect to the investigative documents that are
                    PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM
                    OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
```

included in Defendant's Exhibit 26 and those that are included in the file Defendant's Exhibit 25, those are accurate representations of the investigation conducted by the RPD and the records that they have with that investigation? I can't speak for 400 officers whose signatures are in this file and one of them whom is dead at this point. speak for my work product and my work product only. Now, as the individual who conducted the felony report or drafted the felony report to the District Attorney's Office, you would have reviewed all of the materials though, isn't that correct? I would have access to them all, yes sir. And you would have reviewed it when providing that to ensure that you had all the material provided to the District Attorney's Office that it needed? I'm quite sure I would have transcribed addresses,

phone numbers from one to the other.

And reviewed the statements?

I'm not sure whether I would have sat there and reread the statements just filling out a name and address on a felony report, no, sir.

- Would you have known the substance of the statements?
- 23 Α Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

25

Because you would have discussed them with the other officers, is that right?

1	A I would have physically read them myself, been
2	present for them, or discussed them, yes, sir.
3	Q Now, with respect to the materials in Defendant's
4	Exhibit 26 let me ask you this first. How important are the
5	first few months of the investigation from your experience?
6	A Generalizing, the first part of any investigation is
7	always critical and when you tend to receive the most
8	information, but the breaking information or the most important
9	piece of information can come months, years, decades later from
10	a crime.
11	Q Now, of course, on October 14, 1995, medical
12	examiners said that this was a homicide, correct?
13	A That's correct.
14	Q So, your investigation would have began on
15	October 14, 1995?
16	A Investigation would have started whatever time I was
17	called to the crime scene during that incident, my
18	investigation.
19	Q Do the records of the Rockingham Police Department
20	have any investigative records in it from October 14, 1995
21	through the end of October 1995?
22	A I have no direct knowledge, sir, what's in the
23	current files at the Rockingham Police Department.
24	Q Well, you have a copy of it there. Are there any
25	investigative notes in your copy that you have there,

1 Defendant's Exhibit 26?

1.3

2.1

2.2

A I'm not sure I understand the question. Try me one more time.

Q Well, I'm asking you is that the Rockingham Police Department's file, which is what you looked at when you did the felony investigative report or what you had access to, should it contain records from the month of October 1995 identifying Mr. Rankin dead on a porch on Hood Street?

A Anything to do with the case, yes, sir, it should be in the investigative file.

Q Anything to do with the case. And you were investigating during that period of time, am I correct?

A That's correct.

Q So, I'm asking what's in the file that I've handed you that indicates what took place during the investigation after Mr. Rankin was found dead on Hood Street until the end of October?

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this point. This is irrelevant. If you look at the claims that are presented before this Court, none of them deal with the investigation of Rockingham Police Department or this particular witness. It's all about statements or recanted testimony. So, I object to the relevance at this point.

MR. LAU: Your Honor, if you are aware there is a Brady claim about the cumulative evidence withheld.

Additionally, at the time the MAR was filed, the prior representations to counsel was that this record did not exist, that the master case file was lost, and you heard testimony to that extent or lost or somehow not in the possession of the Rockingham Police Department. So, this only came to our knowledge after it was inadvertently, or advertently, I don't know, after it was revealed to us in response to a public record request that we made relating to this case and our preparation for this hearing. So, I believe it does add to our Brady claim especially the cattail one, and if necessary, we would have amended this point in time to include that on the basis of what we learned through this testimony.

MR. HAIGH: May I respond, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. HAIGH: If you look at the actual statute, they are required to file an amendment at least 30 days prior, so it's a barred. Actually, evidence is already started, that locked it in at that point. They could have filed one before evidence started today and we would have had an opportunity to continue the case at that point. They didn't do so.

Moreover, if you look at what we're talking about here, these are materials that were provided months ago from our office so they did have awareness of what was in the file, and I know that Mr. Lau went to the Rockingham Police Department to

personally review those records. We have a videotape of that process, and that happened several months ago as well.

1.3

2.2

MR. LAU: Your Honor, I would say this in response to that. The same statute that Mr. Haigh refers to discusses our opportunity to amend at the conclusion of this hearing based on the evidence presented. The problem with the State's position is that this Court will see that the records do not exist from the response by the Rockingham Police Department until February 21, 1996. There is nothing there. Now, can we file a Brady claim on the basis of nothing? We need to talk about what took place during that period of time. Whether or not there were potentially favorable evidence that should have been turned over, and we didn't have that opportunity until today, until we got to ask questions of Mr. Voorhees and other investigative officers if Mr. Voorhees can't answer those questions.

Furthermore, there may be a claim, if it's established in his testimony — we have to have the testimony come out today and amend as required by the testimony. If the exculpatory evidence is purged in bad faith or favorable evidence is purged in bad faith, then under Arizona versus Youngblood, which is a Supreme Court decision, that's a due process violation entitled in our client to relief. We're simply trying to understand why it is that this investigation seems to have only — not only given to the District Attorney's

Office only statements and evidence that are inconsistent or inculpatory of Mr. McRae and everything else seems to be purged from the record. What we're trying to learn was, was those in the record and what's the reason it was purged. And that's where this is going.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, I would just make one distinction before the Court and that is defense counsel is right, that they can be amended at the close of the evidence, but they can amend with regard to relevant evidence of a claim that is already made, not a completely new claim, and that's the distinction here. This is something that is —they're limited by what's before the Court once evidence started here today.

MR. LAU: And as I said, we made the claim. It's a Brady claim that says that we weren't provided certain evidence and we're just trying to see what, in addition, wasn't provided to have a full understanding of the record of what happened in this case.

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, we're here for a hearing, not a fishing expedition. This is something that should've have been done ahead of time.

THE COURT: Let me be sure I understand. You have had everything that's in Defendant's Exhibit 26?

MR. HAIGH: Your Honor, this is something that I provided to the defense.

THE COURT: Right. I thought when we had the bench conference, the last few pages didn't --

1.3

2.2

MR. HAIGH: There are materials that I have never seen before that was provided directly to defense counsel from Rockingham Police Department. At least, that's my understanding.

THE COURT: But you didn't provide those.

MR. HAIGH: No, I did not. But this witness, again, you know, it's long past his tenure there.

THE COURT: I don't think it's fair for you to be surprised by materials in this packet that have not been reviewed yet. I would otherwise be inclined, as I have been all day long, to let you gentlemen inquire of this or any other witness about these documents if there is no unfair surprises.

Now, the documents themselves, whether they fall within a claim that's been asserted, I'll decide. And it may be that they indeed do not, but for purposes of this hearing and not having to play games with what -- not to play games, but having to decide what goes before a jury and what doesn't go before a jury, I'm inclined to hear everybody out. It may very well be that this does not come with any of those claims, and your argument is well taken with respect to what they may do at this point. I don't know whether you're going to try to find some way in your present claim to go into that. You've

1 indicated you think you can do that. I'm going to give you the 2 chance. 3 MR. LAU: We have to understand what it is that's 4 missing. I just said I'm going to give you that 5 THE COURT: 6 chance, but you understand what I'm saying about the claim's 7 been filed for months and months and months if we're going to 8 go on what there is here, but I'm going to give you a full 9 and fair opportunity. I'm going to give both of you a full 10 and fair opportunity to ask about these documents. 11 Noting the time, why don't we just stop here today 12 and take whatever time you need in the course of the evening to 1.3 look over your additional documents. 14 And you say you just got these additional documents 15 today? 16 MR. HAIGH: Yes, when counsel went up to the bench 17 with that exhibit. 18 THE COURT: All right. And I understand this officer is from the Rockingham Police Department, and sir, you wanted 19 20 to retake custody of your file. 2.1 THE WITNESS: I would, sir. 2.2 THE COURT: All right. And you can be back with us 23 at 9:30 in the morning with your file? 24 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

```
Anything further this afternoon.
 1
 2
               MR. LAU: No, that would be all.
               THE COURT: We'll be in recess till 9:30 tomorrow
 3
       morning.
 4
                     (Court adjourned at 5:00 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
                         END OF VOLUME I OF III
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                    PATRICE B. LEE, CVR-CM
                     OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
```

STATE	OF	NORTH	CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY	Z OF	RICH	MOND)

CERTIFICATE

I, Patrice B. Lee, the officer before whom the foregoing proceeding was taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, inclusive, are a true, correct and verbatim transcript of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was heard; and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, and am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name, this 29th day of November, 2016.

Patrice B. Lee

Patrice B. Lee, CVR-CM Official Court Reporter Superior Court 704-287-3609